



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0606
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	24 Alexandra Park Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2AB
Proposal:	Erection of single storey ground floor rear extension.
Case Officer:	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date:	06/03/2024
	4
Applicant:	Miss Nicola Maria Fisher
Agent:	Mrs Maria Steimberg

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This is an application for proposed single storey ground floor rear extension to provide an enlarged dining area.

Site and Surroundings

The subject site contains a ground floor flat within a 2-storey mid-terrace property located on the southern side of Alexandra Park Road, N10. Surrounding area is wholly residential in character. The site does not contain a listed building and is located within Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

HGY/2020/1428 – Refused Permission 27/07/2020 - Erection of single storey ground floor rear extension.

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

1) LBH Conservation Officer: no comments

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 14 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 1

Objecting: 1

Supporting: 0

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

- Adjoining neighbour objects to the proposal on the grounds that the proposed extension when viewed from the adjacent ground floor rear windows of their property at no. 26 would result in an unacceptable loss of outlook and amenity.
- The extension would create significant overshadowing and a loss of daylight on the French window of our living room (which would be entirely within the 45 degree shadow area of the new proposed extension), and partially on the French window of their side extension (kitchen),
- Because of its identical concept and very similar size, the proposed plan is not substantially different in terms of impact on our property from application HGY/2020/1428 (an analogous extension on the same site), which was denied as (amongst other things) it would have resulted in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenities. Given the current proposal is only marginally different from proposal HGY/2020/1428. So the current application should be refused.

Comments on representations:

- The objector's comments are noted. However, the staggered nature of the adjoining properties already creates overshadowing to rear of the adjoining properties. However the depth of the extension at 3.8m, it is not of a sufficient scale to be overly obtrusive or to appear dominating or overbearing from the windows or garden of no.26 sufficient to cause significant material harm to residents living conditions in respect of outlook and light. A sunlight daylight assessment had been undertaken and the development retained satisfactory levels of sunlight/ daylight on the adjoining occupiers.

4 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
 2. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
- Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to

extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

Along Alexandra Park Road there is strong consistency in the appearance of the frontages to these houses. Despite the variety of house types they are all of a similar architectural style and have pitched, predominantly slate, roofs with decorative ridge tiles and upstands, bay windows and generally consistent rendered detailing, fenestration, doors and decorative timber porches. Common themes between the properties include bays and porches. Occasional gables along the frontage provide interest at roof level.

The proposed rear extension would be restricted to the width of the current outrigger. This represents a material change to the scheme refused from before which was 4.7m covering full width of the site. It is noted the overall depth of the proposed extension has also been reduced from 4.7m to 3.8m. This revised scheme serves to overcome the previous reason for refusal.

The proposed extension would be modest in bulk and scale and subordinate to the main dwelling. The extension here would respond to the material of the existing house, with this an acceptable approach and encouraged given the uniform appearance to the backs of these properties in terms of materials. The extension would be finished in materials to match those of the existing dwelling. The roof design with an asymmetrical roof form with the roof ridge sitting slightly below the sill of the first-floor window is subordinate to the host three-storey rear elevation and considered appropriate.

The proposal is considered proportionate and subordinate to the host building and would not negatively impact the amenity of the site, or adjoining properties. Therefore, the local character and visual amenity of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area would 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. 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.

It is noted that subsequent to the refusal of permission Ref: HGY/2020/1428 in 2020, No 26 (adjoining property to east) has been extended by way of a side extension. The internal re-configured layout to this property is noted.

As per the plans submitted it is noted the extension is relatively low in height, with an eaves height of 2.4m on the shared boundary, where there is currently a relatively high fence. In respect of No 26 and noting the stepped arrangement of the houses in this terrace, it is noted that light and outlook to the nearest rear facing window to 26, is in part restricted. While a rear extension to back of the outrigger here has some implications for conditions of daylight/ sunlight and outlook, the extent of such impact is not expected to be significant, i.e. given the height and roof form of the

extension over and above the fence line is not significant. Taking account of the points above and the fact that the nearest affected room serving No 26 now benefits from a secondary source of light, the impact on No.26 would not be sufficient to cause significant material harm to residents living conditions in respect of outlook and light.

In relation to No 22 the proposed rear extension would also be set in sufficiently from the shared boundary so as not to be overbearing or materially affect conditions of daylight/ sunlight.

Conclusion

The proposal on balance is considered acceptable and would not have any significant harm on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. Proposal would have an acceptable design and appearance which would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

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

5. CIL APPLICABLE

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq. m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

6. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday

8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.