



# Officer Report

|                            |                                                                            |
|----------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | <b>HGY/2023/2926</b>                                                       |
| <b>Application Type:</b>   | <b>Householder planning permission</b>                                     |
| <b>Address:</b>            | 10 Ringwood Avenue, Hornsey, London, N2 9NS                                |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Erection of a detached rear garden building to house swimming pool and gym |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Oskar Gregersen                                                            |
| <b>Valid Date:</b>         | 30/10/2023                                                                 |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | mr B Charalambous                                                          |
| <b>Agent:</b>              | michael david                                                              |

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Refuse**

#### **1. Proposed development**

This is an application for the erection of a new outbuilding in the rear garden of No 10 Ringwood Avenue. The outbuilding is proposed to be 25m in length and 8m in width, the building would have a dual pitch roof up to a maximum height of 4m with an eaves height of 2m. The building would be finished in brick and hung roof tile with rooflights and sliding doors in the western elevation.

#### **2. Site and Surroundings**

The application site is a large, detached house, which appears to occupy the space of two sites when compared to the surrounding properties. The application site and surrounding area are typified by large houses on large plots with the majority being detached or semi-detached. The application site has multiple front-facing gable ends and benefits from a large rear garden and sizable front driveway.

The application site is not located within a conservation area.

#### **3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history**

The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows.

HGY/2022/2737 | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 8m, for which the maximum height would be 3.5m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m No Required

#### **4. Consultation Response**

- No responses

## 5. Local Representations

The application has been publicised by way of 9 letters. No representations were received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

## 6. Material Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity, &
3. Tree and Landscaping.

### Design and appearance

This application is being considered against DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' and DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' which requires buildings/structures to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, sensitive to landscaped areas and tree provision and to safeguard neighbouring amenity. DPD Policy DM1 requires that proposals respect surrounding context and appear subordinate to the host dwellinghouse on the site and to respond to trees on and close to a site.

Permission is sought for the erection of a large outbuilding, along the southeastern border of the site, to house a swimming pool, gym/rest area, WC facilities, and associated plant. The outbuilding would be 25m deep, by 8m wide, with an eaves height of 2m pitching up to 4m. The proposed outbuilding would have a dual pitch roof and would be finished in materials similar to the host building.

The existing dwellinghouse has a floor area measuring 113.5sqm, with permission for a large householder rear extension granted under prior approval (HGY/2022/2737) which would take the total ground floor area of the host dwellinghouse to just over 200sqm. The proposed outbuilding would have a floor area of 200sqm.

Given the large footprint of the building the proposal would not appear sub-ordinate to the host dwelling, rather it would be an overly dominant structure at odds with the pattern of development to the surrounding area and would amount to an overdevelopment of this site. Specifically on this point, given this structure is 200 sqm in size it is brought into question as to whether it is reasonably required for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of this dwellinghouse.

As such the proposal is viewed to be contrary to the policies outlined above.

### 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. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

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 amenity of neighbouring resident.

The proposed outbuilding would see the erection of a building 350mm in from the boundary with No. 8 Ringwood Avenue. This outbuilding would be 25m long and have an eaves height of 2m, with a dual pitched roof up to 4m in height. The application site and neighbouring properties benefit from large rear gardens.

Given the proposed outbuilding would be situated very close to the boundary with No. 8 Ringwood Avenue, it is deemed that the scale of this proposal, despite the low eaves height, would nonetheless appear overbearing and intrusive in terms of the residential and visual amenity to the adjoining occupiers, as such contrary to policy.

#### Trees and Landscaping

London Plan Policy G7 requires existing trees of value to be retained, and any removal to be compensated by adequate replacement. This policy further sets out that planting of new trees, especially those with large canopies, should be included within development proposals.

DPD Policy DM1 requires proposals demonstrate how landscaping and planting are integrated into a development as a whole, responding to trees on and close to the site.

Within this garden and in adjoining sites there are well established trees, important to the verdant character of this area as well as biodiversity.

The Council's Arboricultural Officer was consulted on the application who highlighted the lack of submission of an Arboricultural Assessment. As such, in the absence of sufficient information it cannot be demonstrated that the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the health of existing trees both within and immediately outside the application site.

Additionally, the application site and surrounding properties are typified by large gardens to the rear, as noted important to the verdant character of the area. The introduction of such a large building in terms of footprint would remove a large area of garden suitable for soft landscaping, with no mitigation proposed.

As such, Officers deem that the proposal would not comply with London Plan Policy G7, nor DPD Policy DM1 as the proposal would constitute a significant reduction in space for soft landscaping, a feature typical to the application site and surrounding area, with equally potential harm to the health of existing trees within and next to this site.

## Conclusion

In summary the proposed development by reason of its large footprint, siting, depth and associated loss of space for soft landscaping and potential harm to the health of existing trees within and next to this site, would be at odds with the pattern of development to the surrounding area, as well as harmful to the residential and visual amenities of the area, contrary to the policies outlined above.

The proposal is considered not acceptable as it would lead to an overdevelopment of the site and introduce a building insubordinate to the host building contrary to London Plan (2021).

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. CIL Applicable**

The increase in internal floor area would exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore if recommended or allowed on appeal would be liable for CIL.

## **8. Recommendation**

It is therefore recommended that this application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

### **Refusal Reasons:**

The proposed development by reason of its large footprint, siting, depth and associated loss of space for soft landscaping and potential harm to the health of existing trees within and next to this site, would be at odds with the pattern of development to the surrounding area and amount to an overdevelopment of this site, as well as being harmful to the residential and visual amenities of the area, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, DPD (2017) and Policy G7 of the London Plan (2021).