



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/3193
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	5 Admiral Place, Hornsey, London, N8 0AF
Proposal:	Single storey infill extension to front of property.
Case Officer:	Sion Asfaw
Valid Date:	22/11/2024
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Edward & Phoebe Taylor
Agent:	Mr William Taylor

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Proposed development

This is an application for the erection of a single storey front extension. The proposed front infill extension would be across the front garden of the dwelling. It would have a flat roof, with a maximum height of 3.2m. The resultant front extension would serve a home office and would have a depth of 3m and a width of 3.4m.

2. Site and Surroundings

The subject property is a three-storey terraced townhouse located within a modern development comprising two parallel rows of contemporary homes. The development is centered around a landscaped communal courtyard with designated parking spaces and mature trees, contributing to a shared space.

The dwellings are defined by their pitched gable roofs, uniform brick façades, and large ground-floor windows, which provide ample natural light to internal living spaces. The subject property features a distinctive grey entrance door with minimalist detailing, set under a simple canopy. The façade is complemented by planters and low-maintenance landscaping in the front garden area.

Neighbouring properties exhibit a harmonious architectural style, creating a cohesive and visually appealing streetscape. The consistent use of materials and architectural features ensures uniformity across the development.

The site is not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

PRE/2024/0143-We wish to enlarge our house now we have a growing family with girls of 1 and 4 years of age and do not want to move from this safe and friendly courtyard location. The rear gardens only 4 m deep so we would like to add a two-storey bay projecting 1350mm to the front elevation and remodel the interior. The roof would be subservient to the existing and all the existing materials are still available and can be matched. Your pre-application advice would be very much appreciated. Short Advice Given 09/05/2024

4. Internal consultation response

None.

5. Local representations

The application was advertised by way of letters sent to neighbouring properties. 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: 5

Objecting: 5

Supporting: 0

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

- Design Concerns: The proposal disrupts the uniform aesthetic of the seven identical houses in Admiral Place, breaking the front building line and creating an inconsistent appearance.
- Undesirable Precedent: Approval could set a precedent for further alterations, affecting the uniformity of the development.
- Access and Parking Issues: The narrow, single-gate access and limited parking make it impractical to accommodate construction vehicles and equipment without affecting resident access and parking.
- Health, Safety, and Disruption: Construction would impact the communal courtyard, restrict movement, and pose safety risks, particularly for children. Noise, dust, and material storage would be disruptive.
- Consent: All residents affected due to the shared communal space. The proposal lacks clear justification for design and construction impact mitigation.

5. Material planning considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance.
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and appearance

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' requires extensions or alterations to residential buildings to be of a high, site-specific, and sensitive design quality, and to respect and/or complement the form, setting, and architectural characteristics of the original building. 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, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

The application property forms part of a recently constructed contemporary terrace of seven dwellings at Admiral Place. The terrace is defined by its cohesive architectural design, characterized by flush front entrances with flat roof canopies above, and a uniform façade that maintains consistency across all properties in the development.

Despite the applicant's amendments to reduce the proposal to a single-storey extension, the proposed front extension remains unacceptable as it would introduce an uncharacteristic feature that disrupts the uniform frontage of the terrace. The proposed structure, even with matching materials and a lean-to roof design, would compromise the coordinated architectural rhythm of Admiral Place, resulting in an inconsistent and visually disruptive appearance when viewed from within the communal courtyard. The terrace's uniform design is an essential characteristic of its architectural identity, and the introduction of the extension would erode this coherence.

The proposal is therefore unacceptable with regards to design and character considerations and fails to comply with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017), and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

Impact on neighbouring amenity

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. The modest scale and bulk of the proposed extension would not have a significant impact on the light, outlook, or privacy of neighbouring occupants. However, the proposal would introduce practical challenges for residents due to its construction and the impact on communal spaces.

The narrow, single-gate access and limited parking at Admiral Place make it impractical to accommodate construction vehicles and equipment without affecting resident access and parking. While the applicant has proposed manual delivery of materials and use of their private parking space for storage, the logistics of such arrangements remain unconvincing given the constraints of the site. Furthermore, the communal courtyard serves as a vital shared space, particularly for families with children, and construction activity in this space would pose potential safety risks and cause significant disruption due to noise, dust, and material handling.

The proposal would also set an undesirable precedent for further alterations to the terrace, jeopardising the uniformity and cohesion of the development. The agent's assurances

regarding material storage and construction management do not sufficiently mitigate these concerns.

Despite the applicant's responses and proposed construction measures, the proposal remains unacceptable due to its detrimental impact on the design and appearance of the terrace, practical access challenges, potential disruption to communal spaces, and the undesirable precedent it would set. The application is therefore contrary to Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017), and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

Conclusion

Taking account of the matters discussed above, the proposal is considered unacceptable in design terms.

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. 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.

8. Recommendation

Refuse planning permission for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed front extension would introduce an uncharacteristic feature that would interrupt the consistency and uniformity of frontage treatments within the terrace when viewed from Admiral Place, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider locality, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017).