

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0870
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	246 Park Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8JX
Proposal:	Erection of first floor rear extension.
Case Officer:	Mercy Oruwari
Valid Date:	27/03/2024
	4
Applicant:	mr andy kyprianou
Agent:	Mr david barnard

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site contains a 2-storey mid-terrace dwellinghouse located on the northern side of Park Road N8. The site is part of a group of five distinctive properties, which form a strong, united character. The upper floors of the rear of the properties are highly visible from Park Avenue South. The site does not fall within a conservation area and is not within the curtilage of a listed building.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a first-floor extension over the single storey outrigger.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

- HGY/2023/1971 - Replacement of existing single storey rear extension with larger full width extension. Granted
- HGY/2023/1921 - Certificate of lawfulness: proposed use for the enlargement of the existing rear dormer including the insertion of 3x front rooflights and full width rear Juliet balcony - proposed use. Permitted Development
- HGY/2012/0969 - Creation of basement extension and alterations to front lightwell. Granted
- HGY/1996/0791 – Lawful Development: Proposed use - Erection of rear dormer window and provision of 3 velux windows at front elevation. Decision unknown

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

There were no consultations sought for this planning application.

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: 3

Objecting: 3

Support: 0

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

- Overlooking and loss of privacy.
- Overshadowing and loss of light.
- Overbearing.
- Loss of outlook.
- Out of character.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

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

Impact on the character and appearance of the area

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 site is not in a conservation area; however, the two storey terraced properties from No. 244-252 have a distinct architectural design and features as a group. These set of houses provides a coherent character and unique cottage style appearance on this part of Park Road. This includes the rear of the properties especially with the upper floor levels being highly visible over the fence line when travelling along Park Avenue South.

Despite the changes on ground floor and roof levels, this group of houses are well-designed and maintain a consistency both to the front and back. The brick work at rear on the first floor is an attractive feature. This along with the flush continuous line of windows and window dressings create a sense of uniformity.

The proposal includes a first-floor extension, which would be marginally wider than the existing ground floor outrigger. The first-floor structure would be built where the southern upper floor window is currently located. A new window would be installed to the end of the new extension. Although the new window would be a four pane, sash- style installment, it would not match the

dimension or window design of the original and the existing fenestration of this property or the group.

Overall, with the recently approved ground floor full width extension, and the enlargement of the dormer, the property will be significantly extended from its original state. Therefore, the additional first floor extension would result in significant changes on all three levels of this modest sized terrace, retaining very little of the original, rear façade.

As states above, this set of houses (No's 244-252) have largely maintained and preserved their original features at the rear on the upper levels. The proposed, first floor structure would be considered incongruous for the property, and the neighbouring houses as it would fail to respect the architectural detailing of the original buildings. It would detract from the uniformity of the first-floor brick work and consistent flush fenestration. This would introduce an element of design which in turn has the potential to weaken the character and appearance of this part of the road.

It is acknowledged that there are neighbouring properties with double storey outriggers; however, these are bigger houses with a villa style character. This group of houses contributes positively to the streetscene, especially being so highly visible from the adjacent street. The proposal undermines this by interrupting the pattern of development of these properties and is considered as harmful to this group of houses. It is therefore considered that such a development would not be acceptable from a design and character point of view.

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 first floor extension would mostly match the depth and breadth of the existing ground floor outrigger. Therefore, the structure would also not project beyond the depth of the mirroring ground floor outrigger of No. 244. Also the nearest upper floor window of No. 244 is positioned at an angle which faces No. 242. Taken the above into consideration it is unlikely that the first-floor structure would appear overbearing or impact the outlook of this neighbour.

The proposed first extension would not be full width and is set back some distance from the boundary shared with No. 248. This creates a reasonable separation gap between the side elevation of the new structure and the boundary of No 248. It is considered that the separation is wide enough to mitigate any significant amenity impacts to this neighbouring property.

In addition, the 45 degree test for both neighbours shows that neither side would be impacted in relation to the outlook from their closest rear facing windows. Therefore, the height and depth of the upper floor rear extension would not adversely impact the amenity of these adjoining neighbouring properties.

However, concerns were raised regarding overlooking and loss of privacy for No. 2 Park Avenue South at the rear of the host site. The window of the new structure projecting further into the garden on the upper level would be closer to the rear neighbouring garden and building.

The existing arrangement of these set of terraces already lends itself to a level of mutual overlooking from the upper floor windows. However, given the modest length of the rear garden and the close proximity of the neighbouring garden/building, it is considered that there would be a significant degree of increased overlooking for this neighbour. This is considered significantly detrimental to the amenity of the No. 2 Park Avenue South.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the property, the terrace and the surrounding area. It would also cause significant harm to the amenity of the rear neighbouring property at No. 2 Park Avenue South.

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. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed first floor extension, by reason of its design and character would fail to respect or complement the architectural characteristics and detailing of the original building and the surrounding context, and therefore represent poor quality design, contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed development would have a significant adverse effect on the amenity of the rear neighboring property through the creation of overlooking and a resulting loss of privacy contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.