



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2947
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	31 Priory Avenue, Hornsey, London, N8 7RP
Proposal:	Second floor rear extension to outrigger roof
Case Officer:	Ben Coffie
Valid Date:	01/11/2023
Applicant:	Mr and Mrs Triada and Christopher Pulham
Agent:	Mr Ibi Ekineh

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is two storey terrace dwelling located in the east side of Priory Avenue. Priory Avenue is a residential street comprised of two storey Edwardian houses. Whilst these terrace houses are of a consistent architectural design there are some subtle differences in style. The backs of these properties have mirroring/ symmetrical two storey outriggers with flat roof sitting. This consistency, uniformity and sense of rhythm is an intrinsic part of the original design to these houses and in turn the character of the area. The properties here are however not located in a conservation area.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for an additional floor above the existing outrigger.

3.Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

HGY/2015/0615,

Address: 31, Priory Avenue, London, N8 7RP

Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extension,

Decision Date: 23 April 2015

Decision: Approve with Conditions

HGY/2015/2620,

Address: 31, Priory Avenue, London, N8 7RP

Proposal: Erection of single storey side and rear extension.,

Decision Date: 4 November 2015

Decision: Approve with Conditions

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

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 1
Objecting 1
Support 0
Neither 0

The following issues were raised in representations and are addressed further on in this report or below:

1. Loss of daylight/sunlight to first floor bathroom and second floor bedroom
2. The development is out of keeping with the terrace.

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 proposed second storey rear extension would be located above the existing two storey outrigger. It will measure a height of 2.7m, a depth of 5.4m and a width of 3.5m. The design of the extension will match the fenestration of the host dwelling and the proposed external materials will match the existing materials of the host dwelling.

The outriggers within the terrace have been maintained at two storeys. As a consequence of its elevated position such an extension would be seen as a highly prominent and incongruous feature from neighbouring properties etc, detracting from the established character and appearance of these terrace houses, which as explained above, has a distinct and repeated pattern of outriggers in terms of form, height and appearance.

The approval of such an extension here would therefore erode this established character and be harmful to the appearance of this property and of these terrace properties, and as such is viewed to be contrary to the policies outlines 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.

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.

The proposed second-floor extensions would impinge on a line drawn at 45 degrees from the centre of the attached neighbour's rear habitable windows at no.33, which indicates that the proposed extension will be harmful in terms of conditions of daylight, sunlight and outlook.

Equally due to the excessive the depth of the extension, will adversely impact the occupiers of no.29 as their outlook will be reduced significantly from the rear bedroom at second floor level.

The new fenestration on the rear elevation of the first-floor elevations will not introduce new overlooking over and above the current situation. No side windows are proposed on the sides of the first-floor extensions.

Overall, the proposed first-floor extensions would have any adverse impact in terms of the amenity currently enjoyed by occupiers of neighbouring properties, with therefore the proposal considered contrary to the policies outlined above.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposal is considered unacceptable in respect of its character, appearance and the pattern of development of the area and would result in material harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. 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.RECOMMENDATIO

1. The proposed extension by reason of its inappropriate siting and bulk would fail to respect the appearance of this property, the pattern of development and rhythm to the row of properties within this terrace, overall being harmful to the character and visual amenities of the area, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and policies DM1 and D12 of the Haringey Development Management Plan (2017).

2. The proposed extension due to its size and siting would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties No 29 and 33 in terms of loss of light and outlook from its rear facing windows and have an overbearing effect contrary to DPD Policies DM1 and DM2, and London Plan Policy D6.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed extension by reason of its inappropriate siting and bulk would fail to respect the appearance of this property, the pattern of development and rhythm to the row of properties within this terrace, overall being harmful to the character and visual amenities of the area, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and policies DM1 and D12 of the Haringey

Development Management Plan (2017).

The proposed extension due to its size and siting would be detrimental to the residential amenity of the neighbouring properties No 29 and 33 in terms of loss of light and outlook from its rear facing windows and have an overbearing effect contrary to DPD Policies DM1 and DM2, and London Plan Policy D6.