



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0130
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Flat 1, 89 Priory Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8LY
Proposal:	Single storey ground floor rear, side return extension and internal alterations to existing dwelling to provide additional space for living accommodation and a 3rd bedroom.
Case Officer:	Eunice Huang
Valid Date:	07/02/2024
Applicant:	4
Agent:	Povoleri and Agenet

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

2.1 This application is for single storey ground floor rear, side return extension and internal alterations to existing dwelling to provide additional space for living accommodation and a 3rd bedroom.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is located on the western side of Priory Road. The site is a two storey semi-detached dwellinghouse, with a mansard roof. The dwellinghouse has been divided into three flats. The development pertains to Flat 1 on the ground floor level, with direct access to a rear garden. The building is not located in a conservation area or within the curtilage of a listed building. The semi-detached dwelling forms a pair with the east-adjointing semi-detached dwelling at No. 87.

2.3 The rear elevation of the dwellinghouse has a three storey scale, with an outrigger on the western side. The outrigger steps down from a three storey height to a two storey height. The east-adjointing semi-detached dwelling has a mirrored layout, with an two-to-three

storey outrigger on its eastern side. This adjoining neighbour also has a single storey conservatory constructed to the common boundary.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

2.4 The most recent planning history relating to the site as is as follows:

- HGY/2004/2061 – Conversion from a 1 bedroom flat to a 2 bedroom flat – Approved with conditions 05/11/2004.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 No consultation responses were received.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 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: 4

Support: 1

Object: 3

4.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Overbearing due to height and closeness to No. 87
- Overshadowing
- 2m rear projection beyond existing rear façade is not compatible with semi-detached pair at Nos. 87 & 89.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

- Design & Appearance; and
- Neighbour Amenity.

5.2 Local Plan Policy SP11 (2017) and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects local context and character to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity.

5.3 DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to meet a range of criteria having regard to the following: building heights; form, scale and massing prevailing around the site; urban grain; sense of enclosure and where appropriate following existing building lines; rhythm of neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths; active, lively frontages to public realm; and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials. This policy also 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 residents.

5.4 Policy DM12 of the Haringey's Development Management DPD specifies that extensions to residential buildings should be subordinate in scale to the original building, as well as respect the architectural unity of a block or terrace of houses and the urban grain and character of the surrounding area. New development should not undermine existing uniformity of the building or terrace, and should not over balance or dominate existing features important to the building. The policy further elaborates that the depth of rear extension should be such that the resulting footprint is subordinate to the main house and does not have a negative impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties, ensuring no overlooking or inappropriate loss of daylight and sunlight

5.5 The proposal includes the erection of a rear extension on the ground floor, with a flat roof. The proposed extension infills the passageway between the eastern side boundary and the existing outrigger. The rear extension projects 2m beyond the existing rear façade. It has a width of 3.86m when measured across its rear facade. The height of the extension is 3m.

5.6 The design, size, scale and siting of the proposed rear extension would be subservient to the host building, which has a three storey scale at the rear elevation. The rear extension would also retain legibility of the existing outrigger form of the host building. However, further consideration is required of the proposed design in relation to neighbouring properties in the semi-detached row between No. 87 to 93 Priory Road.

5.7 Objections have been raised against the proposal in respect to the rear projection and its overbearing and overshadowing impact upon No. 87 to the east. The submitted drawings posit an established building from No. 87-93 based on the rear facades of the rear extensions of No. 91 and No. 93. The proposed rear extension would be constructed to this established building line. However, it should be noted that the rear extensions at No. 91 and No. 93 respond to the existing layout of the outrigger forms – i.e. the volume of the rear extensions are set in from the common boundary of the pair at No. 91 and No. 93. More specifically, the rear extension of No. 91 is a continuation of the outrigger projection, maintaining its width and the side passageway. The rear extension at No. 93 concentrates its volume on the western side, where its outrigger is sited; the projection recedes near the eastern boundary, with its roof pitching down to this boundary. In this respect, the designs at No. 91 and 93 mitigates amenity impact upon each other.

5.8 The proposed rear extension at the application site would be constructed adjacent to the existing conservatory at No. 87, and extend 3.1m beyond this conservatory. The 3.1m long flank wall on this boundary, at a consistent height of 3m, would have an overbearing impact on the adjoining neighbour. Neighbour objections have included photographs with timber frames erected to demonstrate the proposed bulk and scale of the extension; the measurements of these frames have not been verified, but do indicate the amenity impact.

5.9 The proposal would also have a material impact upon the sunlight and daylight access of No 87, particularly the conservatory. Based on 45 degree analysis in both plan and

elevation, the proposal would result in overshadowing on the rear conservatory glazing, particularly in the afternoon.

5.10 The proposed bulk, scale and siting of the development is not acceptable because it would have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal does not satisfy Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017, and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017.

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

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

1. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its size, scale, and siting would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal would have an overbearing effect on neighbouring residences. It would also impact the daylight and sunlight access of neighbouring properties. The proposed design thus does not satisfy Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed rear extension, by reason of its size, scale, and siting would have an adverse impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties. The proposal would have an overbearing effect on neighbouring residences. It would also impact the daylight and sunlight access of neighbouring properties. The proposed design thus does not satisfy Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.