



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/1029
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	76 Weston Park, Hornsey, London, N8 9TB
Proposal:	Erection of a rear ground floor single storey infill kitchen extension, opening up of ground floor kitchen area, relocation of ground floor WC.
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	12/04/2024
Applicant:	Richard Kent
Agent:	Mr Jack Harding

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a mid-terrace dwelling house on the north side of Weston Park. The site lies in the Crouch End conservation area. It does not fall within the curtilage of a nationally and locally listed building. It is to the east of the junction of Aubery Road, Weston Park, and Bourne Road.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for the erection of a rear ground floor single storey infill kitchen extension, opening up of ground floor kitchen area, relocation of ground floor WC.

The rear elevation would appear to have a have wall adjacent No.78 due to parapet, however, the side elevation adjacent to No.78 would predominantly be at a height of 2.5m along the side boundary due to the slope roof behind the parapet.

A revised drawing for the proposed ground floor plan was provided to show the location of the four stems of the Lilac on 3rd June 2024. This was supported by a letter to address the objection raised by the neighbour at No.78, which has been outlined in the consultation responses section.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/2000/0288 – Erection of rear extension. Unknown decision on 21/03/2000.

HGY/1999/1605 – Conversion of ground floor and top floor self contained flats to a single family dwelling house (Certificate of Lawfulness). Granted permission on 25/01/2000.

OLD/1973/1908 – Conversion into 2 self-contained flats. Granted permission on 03/10/1973.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

- LBH Aboricultural Officer: Lilacs are generally low grade, woody scrub shrub, common garden plant, non-native, medium lifespan, and split out species that are attractive when in flower and sweet smelling. Whilst this Lilac might have value to the owner, it is not worthy of a TPO. It would be best for the Architect to discuss with the neighbouring property and offer to re plant a few more Lilacs as a replacement.

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**

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

- No.78 stated that the proposed new extension forms part of the boundary wall between their two properties. They have been notified that a shared lilac tree which is located six metres from the house on our shared border will need to be cut down as part of the proposed extension. The roots of this tree extends into their garden and the branches overhang onto their side; it is the focal point of my garden. They said that in spring it blossoms, attracting birds and insects, thus contributing to the local ecosystem. They have asked that the lilac tree be considered when processing this planning application.
- Officer Response: The applicant has made the offer to replace the lilac with one or more lilacs of an adequate size to the neighbour.

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.

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, the policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

The proposed single storey side extension would be 3m wide and 8.27m deep. The extension would directly abut the boundary with No.78 and would not extend on the shared boundary. It would have a pitched roof, pitching down to a height of 2.5m on the boundary with No.78 and 3no. of roof lights. The proposed extension would be modest in bulk and scale and subordinate to the main dwelling. It would extend from the side wall of the outrigger and existing single storey rear extension. The roof above the existing single storey rear extension would be converted to a flat roof that would be slightly lower than neighbouring rear extension at No.74.

The extension would be finished in materials to match those of the existing dwelling. The infill extension here is considered acceptable in design and spatial terms, being subservient to the original house and having minimal impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, as such leaving it preserved. In reaching this decision considerable importance and weight has been given to preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area, in line with the statutory test.

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 Crouch End area would be protected.

The proposal would comply with Policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan 2017 and would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would be acceptable in heritage terms.

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 height and depth of the side extension would not adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring properties. The height and depth of this extension will not affect the amenity to No.78, as the wall to the extension on the boundary is kept low at 2.5m

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed development is in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also does accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

The proposal is considered acceptable in respect of its character, appearance and impact on the site and would not result in material harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following 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.

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.