



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/0591
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Flat A, 87 Southwood Lane, Hornsey, London, N6 5TB
Proposal:	Single storey side extension
Case Officer:	Josh Parker
Valid Date:	
Applicant:	Mr Ben Ponniah
Agent:	Mr Chris Ellerbeck

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SITE AND SURROUNDING

The subject site is a detached, three storey Edwardian era building constructed with a London stock brick with white painted and redbrick decorative elements, timber sash windows and pitched slate roof.

The subject building is in use as 3 flats A, B and C. Access has been created from a northern side extension and there is an additional wrap around extension to the rear.

The street is formed of semidetached and detached buildings with the properties having a mixture of scales, roofs, and styles. Whilst the properties to the southern side have rhythm consistency, the subject site is unique and has a positive contribution when considering the flow and aesthetic of the street. The rear elevations are also significantly more varied, with a mix of styles and architectural detailing.

The property is in the Highgate Conservation Area however is not statutory listed or locally listed.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The applicant is proposing the following works to the dwelling:
Single storey side extension to the south western side of the ground floor.

SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT

All existing planning applications have been considered for this application.

HGY/2001/1343 - Partial demolition of existing rear extension and the reconstruction of a single side extension to accommodate kitchen and bathrooms and a relocation of existing garden shed and the erection of new brick built rear boundary wall.

HGY/2017/2217 - Single storey side and rear extension, following the demolition of an existing side and rear extension. Approved 06/11/2017.

HGY/2018/0971 - Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2017/2217 involving the retention of the existing side and rear projection and change of roof form of front extension from a flat roof to a pitched roof. Approved 29/03/2018.

The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision. Neighbouring properties have received permission for dormers, extensions, alterations, and residential conversions.

CONSULTATION

Highgate society

The addition would block openness and a view to the rear garden contrary with Policy DH4 of the Highgate Conservation area Management Plan and Design guide (HCADG).

Officer comments: Noted, see discussion.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

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

Objections:0

Support:0

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance of Highgate conservation area;
2. Impact on trees;
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and appearance of Highgate conservation area

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, 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. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6. DPD Policy D9 requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas.

Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (NP) Policy DH4 concerns side extensions which should respect the streetscape and not block or significantly infill the gaps between buildings, while being subordinate in scale to the original dwelling and complementing its character. Policy DH3 also requires rear extensions to be subordinate to and complement the original dwelling.

The applicant wishes to rationalise the internal layouts and increase floor space on the ground and floor by adding a study to the rear in front of current parking space. Works would involve a 2.978m (width) by 6.405m (depth) with a single storey flat roof with a skylight.

The Highgate Conservation area Management Plan and Design guide (HCADG), advises that a rear/side extension should respect the streetscape and not block or significantly infill the gaps between buildings, while being subordinate in scale the extension would fill the spacing between the subject site and the adjoining building being No. 67. It should be noted that the building Nos. 65 to 89 are all attractive buildings with different massing, era and styles which contribute positively to the immediate area/CA. Although there is no rhythmic cohesion to this sequence of neighbouring addresses, the range, individuality, spacing and orientation of the buildings contribute to the identity and the addition of a side extension would compromise the uniqueness of the above observations by filling the void. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that the accumulation of the ground floor extensions outlined in the site history with the proposed addition would appear excessive and incongruous.

Given factors such as the accumulation of ground level extensions to the sides and rear and the existing appreciation of the existing spacing and their relationship with the neighbouring buildings. The addition would appear incongruous and cause harm on the CA for the reasons discussed above and therefore would not be acceptable from a design lens.

Impact on Trees

The supporting text to Local Plan 2017 Policy SP13 recognises, “trees play a significant role in improving environmental conditions and people’s quality of life”, where the policy in general seeks the protection, management and maintenance of existing trees. Policy SO4.4 of the HNP seeks to ‘protect and enhance the area’s village character through conservation of its natural features, including trees’ while policy OS2 of the HNP states that there should be no net loss of trees of as a result of development and pro rata replacement will be expected.

As mentioned above in the site history there have been a number of ground floor additions and in the 2017 permissions an arboricultural report accompanied the information to deem if the works would cause harm on the mature sycamore to the rear as the works would encroach into the root protection area (RPA) of the Mature sycamore. The proposed works would project further in to the RPA and potentially cause damage to the root systems of the sycamore and therefore would not be acceptable and conflicts with the aforementioned policies.

Amenity Comments

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.

As mentioned in the design assessment, the massing of the proposed works would be modest in nature. The build would be setback 0.8m from the southern address with windows facing the road and the rear suggesting the addition would not create any adverse privacy issues or being overbearing. The lighting implication from the works would be acceptable as the extension is attached to and neighbouring 3 storey buildings.

All works proposed meet all amenity tests when considering effects on light, bulk, sense of enclosure and privacy for the observations discussed above.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered to cause harm to the Highgate CA and potential harm to the root systems of the mature sycamore to the rear. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed extension by virtue of its siting and combined sized with current extensions would appreciably take from the original form and appearance to this building and would negatively intrude into the visual gap to the side of this property, overall disrupting the architectural composition to this house and the pattern of development of the area, as well as harming the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area, contrary to Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017), as well as Policies DH2 and DH4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017).

The proposed extension would require building works within close proximity to a protected sycamore tree on site, therefore leading to likely disturbance to the root system and the possible decline and removal of this tree, therefore being detrimental to the visual amenity and character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area. The application is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy G7 of the London Plan 2021, and Policy SP13 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policies SO4.4 and OS2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017)