

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2628
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Flat A, 33 Nelson Road, Hornsey, London, N8 9RX
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension to Flat A
Case Officer:	Eunice Huang
Valid Date:	12/10/2023
	3
Applicant:	Joseph Farrugia
Agent:	Ms Petra Osenk

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

1.1 No consultation responses were received.

2. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 The application has been publicised by way of letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 2

2.2 The following issues were raised in the representations, which are addressed in the next section of the report:

- Rear extension is overbearing and bigger than previous application in 2017 which was refused for being dominant and harming the visual amenity of the area. It extends further past than neighbouring properties.
- The scale of the works, combined with the shed/workshop development in the rear garden, dominates the rear garden.
- Loss of light and privacy
- Out of character – timber and fibreglass materials, and form of extension
- It is unclear how a timber structure with fibreglass roof will attach to the party wall and how stormwater drainage will be managed.
- Disturbance from construction (*Officer note: this is not a material planning consideration*).
- Previous construction broke planning permission (*Officer note: this is not a material planning consideration*).

3. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 This is an application for a single storey rear extension to Flat A to gain a new dining area and an office.

3.2 The application site is a two storey mid-terrace dwelling. The site is located on the western side of Nelson Road, within in a residential area. It is not located within a conservation area.

3.3 The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision:

- HGY/2019/1817 – New rear shed to rear of garden – Approved with conditions 6/1/2020
- HGY/2017/2448 – Erection of a rear extension at second floor level to the upper floor flat. Erection of a single storey rear conservatory to the ground floor flat – Refused 3 October 2017.
- HGY/2016/1711 – Erection of a rear extension over the existing extension of the ground and first floor – Refused 20 July 2016
- HGY/2013/0262 – Erection of shed in rear garden – Refused 5 April 2013

3.4 The new single storey rear extension is formed of two distinct additions on either side of the existing central outrigger. The extension to the northern side would form a dining room, while the extension to the southern side facilitates a library and office. The extension has a depth of 5m along the side boundaries, and a height of 2.93m.

3.5 A ground floor rear extension/conservatory was refused under HGY/2017/2448. The refused rear extension had a depth of 4.5m, and a height of 2.7m. The Officer's Report states that: "The rear conservatory would create a bulky structure extending beyond the rear extension of the adjoining properties and would therefore appear dominant and diminish/harm the visual amenity of the area." Specifically, the refused conservatory would extend beyond the extension of No. 35 by 0.8m and No. 31 by 1.5m.

3.6 The proposed single storey rear extension therefore has a greater depth and height than the previously refused scheme. There does not appear to have been any changes to the size and volume of the adjoining rear extensions at No. 35 and No. 31 since the refusal of HGY/2017/2448. The proposed extension would project 1.32m beyond the rear façade of No. 35 and 1.91m beyond the rear façade of No. 31. It is noted that the rear additions are located on either side of the existing outrigger, which assists in reducing the bulk and volume of the extension. However, this does not sufficiently mitigate the dominant appearance of the proposed development from the side adjoining properties. The proposed volume would appear greater than the previously refused scheme from No. 35 and No. 31.

3.7 The proposed size of the rear extension must also be considered in conjunction with the existing/approved shed which occupies a substantial footprint within the rear garden. The depth of the rear extension, along with the size of the existing/approved shed, would dominate the rear garden and adversely impact the appearance and character of the site.

3.8 The proposal materials comprise timber cladding with a fibreglass roof. The proposed materials deviate from the characteristic use of brick materials for rear extensions, which would be in keeping with the materiality of the original buildings.

3.9 The size and volume of the proposed development would appear overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties, specifically No. 35 and No. 31. The proposal would result in some increase in overshadowing upon the side adjoining properties, but the single storey height and the south-west orientation of adjoining rear windows mitigate the extent of the shadow impact. The single storey extension maintains the same floor level as the existing ground floor, and there are no windows directly facing adjoining properties. As such, there would not be a material impact upon privacy of neighbouring properties.

3.10 The proposed development, due to its bulk and scale, does not satisfy Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017, and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also does not accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

3.11 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out below. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

4. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

For the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of size and scale, would result in an over dominant, incongruous and discordant addition to this property, detracting from the appearance of the host building and the terrace row. This is contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).
2. The proposed height and depth of the extension would be overbearing upon the side-adjoining properties at No. 31 and No. 33. The proposed design thus does not satisfy Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, by reason of size and scale, would result in an over dominant, incongruous and discordant addition to this property, detracting from the appearance of the host building and the terrace row. This is contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed height and depth of the extension would be overbearing upon the side-adjoining properties at No. 31 and No. 33. The proposed design thus does not satisfy Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).