



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2882
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	40 Cranley Gardens, Hornsey, London, N10 3AP
Proposal:	Erection of two storey side extension
Case Officer:	Mercy Oruwari
Valid Date:	25/10/2023
Applicant:	Mr Barry Edwards
Agent:	mr Rustem Konakli

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey end semi-detached dwellinghouse on the junction Cranley Gardens and Leinster Road. At the rear of the property is a two-storey full width rear extension. It appears that this may be part of an original double storey rear projection when viewing the outline of neighbouring properties. The house also benefits from a single storey conservatory and a garage at the rear of the garden accessible from Leinster Road.

The position of the property being the last house in the row of semi-detached properties on this part of Cranley Gardens results in the flank wall facing Leinster Road and the rear garden being highly exposed and open visually from all public vantage points. The site does not fall within a conservation area.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for the erection of a two-storey side extension. This is a resubmission of the previously refused HGY/2023/0840, which was for a full height and deeper two storey side extension. The scheme has notably been reduced in size.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

- HGY/2023/0840 - Erection of a two storey side extension including alterations to the roof (Householder planning permission). Refused

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

No internal or external consultees were consulted on the planning application:

Neighbour Consultation

The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses 0

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & appearance

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD both aim to enhance the built environment through high quality design that respects local context and positive aspects of the area. Policy DM1 sets out that development should relate positively to its locality in terms of building height, form, scale, massing, building lines and architectural details and styles.

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.

The full depth double storey side extension which was refused under the previous application HGY/2023/0840 has been reduced in scale in the new proposal. The rear of the extension would now be single storey instead of double. This would retain part of the side/rear of the main house and double storey outrigger. Although the proposed structure would be built up to a full height, the new adjoining hipped roof would be stepped down from the main roof thereby creating a more subordinate roof extension. The new flank wall, unlike the existing and the previous proposal, would have no windows installed.

Although it is noted that the scheme has been reduced in size, the issue of the siting, height, and width of the double storey element of the extension would still pose as a sizeable addition to this property. It would still appear as an awkward bookend, unbalancing the carefully designed row of semi-detached properties. One of the main issues is that the two-storey part of the extension would still appear as an incongruous and dominant feature when viewed from Leinster Road. This would still cause harm to the character and appearance of both these roads given the prominent location.

As stated in the previous application, the position of the current flank wall is carefully set back to respond to and provide an acceptable transition in the building line associated with the properties at the rear on Leinster Road. The two-storey side extension would distort the original planned layout of these two adjoining roads by disrupting the clear sight lines from Cranley Gardens through to the houses on Leinster Road.

It is also noted that the current flank elevation has qualities of age in terms of the painted brick base to the ground floor, rough case render to the first floor, moulding detail and a careful balance of fenestration. This attractive flank wall would be lost with the addition of such an extension.

The proposal is considered to not be proportionate or subordinate to the host building and would negatively impact the amenity of the site and the planned layout of the roads. Therefore, the local character and visual amenity of the area would not be protected.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Due to the position of the development on a corner the height and depth of the extension would not adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring properties.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposal is considered unacceptable in respect of its character, appearance and impact on the site, but would not result in material harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for refusal for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed side extension, by virtue of its siting, form, bulk and detailed design would have a discordant and prominent appearance, failing to integrate harmoniously with the row of semi-detached properties on Cranley Gardens and failing to respect the pattern and character of development of the immediate area, contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of The Development Management DPD (2017).