

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0125
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	6 Colwick Close, Hornsey, London, N6 5NU
Proposal	Erection of roof extension to provide second floor accommodation and other external alterations.
Case Officer	James Mead
Valid Date	13/01/2023
Applicant	A Mortenson
Agent	

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

2.1 This is an application for a roof extension to 6 Colwick Close.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is occupied by a two storey, terraced dwellinghouse. This property sits in a staggered line of terraced properties, which all have mono-pitched sloping roofs. The central properties (Nos. 5, 6 & 7) have roofs that slope downwards south-west to north-east, whereas the roofs of the end properties (Nos. 4, 8 & 9) slope downwards north-east to south-west. Colwick Close is a private road, which runs north-west from Hornsey Lane. This road is made up of rows of similarly designed properties, with sloping roofs. To the south the setting is residential, being mainly made up of blocks of flats. The land to the north is green in character, with an area of dense trees present. The Parkland Walk Local Nature Reserve and Ecological Corridor is also to the north.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

2.3 There is no relevant planning history.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 0 responses were received from consultees.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The application has been publicised by way of 54 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: 5

Objecting: 5

Supporting: 0

4.2 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:

- The roof alteration, the windows and the juliet balcony would interrupt the uniformity of the terrace roofs.
- Loss of light would impact residents at Marbleford Court.
- Overlooking of a number of flats at 125 Hornsey Lane would occur.
- Overlooking of Marbleford Court would occur.

4.3 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- The roof alteration would block views of trees – officers note this comment, however loss of a private view is not a material planning consideration.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Design & Appearance; and
2. Neighbour Amenity.

Design & Appearance

5.2 London Plan Policy D3 outlines that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness, through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Local Plan Policy SP11 requires developments to enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment, creating buildings that are high quality and attractive. Proposals should be of the highest standard of design that respects local context, character and historic significance, in accordance with Local Plan Policy SP11. DM DPD Policy DM1 notes that developments should relate positively to their locality, having regard to: building heights, form, scale, massing, urban grain, existing building lines, plot widths, building widths, architectural styles, detailing and materials. DM DPD Policy DM12 requires extensions, including roof extensions, to be of a high, site-specific and sensitive design quality. Such proposals should respect/complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of original buildings.

5.3 The property currently has a sloping roof, which slopes downwards from south-west to north-east. It is proposed to alter this through constructing a roof extension, which would essentially take the form of a front dormer addition. The significant scale of the roof extension, covering the full roof, means that this addition would not be subservient or subordinate to the host property. Instead, this roof addition would completely overwhelm, dominate and harmfully change the character of the existing property. The extension would result in the loss of the original sloping form of the property, with the dwelling effectively becoming a flat roofed house. Therefore, it is not considered that the addition would respect the form or design of the original and existing property. The lack of subservience and the complete erosion of the original form of the property means that this roof addition would not equate to a high standard of design.

5.4 The houses in this existing row (4 – 9 Colwick Close) all retain sloped roof forms. Therefore, the proposed flat roof would visually contrast with the adjacent properties, resulting in the form of

the host property being at odds with its neighbours. Due to this, it is considered that the host property would appear unreflective, incongruous and alien within this row of houses. As such, the roof addition would detract from the character and form of this row of properties. It is noted that two large roof extensions have been constructed in Colwick Close (Nos.16 & 19). However, the remaining 17 properties in this road retain their sloping roofs. Consequently, these existing roof extensions are anomalies within the road. Noting this, and given that these existing roof extensions do not equate to a high standard design, it is not considered that these enlargements should be mimicked or replicated on other properties in Colwick Close. Therefore, the existence of roof extensions at these two properties does not justify the proposal.

5.5 Overall, the proposed roof extension would fail to be subservient or subordinate to the existing property. Instead, the addition would visually dominate and overwhelm the host property. The loss of the sloping roof of the house means that the extension would not respect the original/existing form of the property. Furthermore, the change to a flat roof would result in the host property appearing incongruous and alien, in relation to this row of terraced houses, where the other dwellings all retain a sloping roof form. Therefore, the roof addition would not represent a high standard of design. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, the row of terraced houses and the surrounding area. The proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policy D3, Local Plan Policy SP11 and DM DPD Policies DM1 & DM12.

Neighbour Amenity

5.6 London Plan Policy D6 outlines that the design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific it is stated that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. Furthermore, DPD Policy DM1 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 open aspects to adjacent buildings and land. Schemes should also avoid overlooking and loss of privacy that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

5.7 The roof extension would be sited within the existing built envelope of the host property and would not increase the maximum height of the dwelling. Due to these factors, it is not considered that the proposal would result in undue: overbearing impacts, loss of light, overshadowing or restriction of outlook impacting any of the neighbouring properties (5, 7, 10, 11 & 12 Colwick Close, 125 Hornsey Lane and Marbleford Court).

5.8 In terms of the potential for overlooking, it is noted that three new second floor windows would be added to the front elevation of the property. However, there is already a degree of mutual overlooking between the host property and the dwellings opposite (10, 11 & 12 Colwick Close). It is not considered that the proposal would materially increase this, particularly as some of the new windows could be fitted with obscured glazing, if deemed necessary. The siting of the roof extension and the lack of any new side windows means that the adjoining properties (5 & 7 Colwick Close) would not be unduly impacted by increased overlooking.

5.9 Objections have been received raising concerns regarding possible overlooking from the new rear facing windows/juliet balcony towards 125 Hornsey Lane and Marbleford Court. These comments are noted, however there would be sufficient distance between the new windows and these neighbouring properties, so to ensure that undue overlooking or loss of privacy would not impact the properties to the south-west (125 Hornsey Lane and Marbleford Court).

5.10 Overall, in terms of neighbour amenity, the proposal would not materially harm the living conditions or privacy of nearby properties.

Conclusion

5.11 The proposal is considered unacceptable, as the roof extension would fail to be a subservient or subordinate addition to the host property. Instead, the roof extension would visually dominate and overwhelm the existing property. The roof extension would result in the loss of the sloped roof form of the property meaning that the addition would not respect the original design of the house, whilst also appearing incongruous, in relation to the neighbouring properties. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, the row of terraced properties and the surrounding area.

5.12 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. CIL APPLICABLE

N/A

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed roof extension, by virtue of its inappropriate size, scale, mass, form and design, would fail to be a subservient or subordinate addition to the host dwelling. Instead, the roof addition would visually overwhelm and dominate the existing property. The loss of the sloping roof of the property and the change to a flat roof would not respect the original form of the host dwelling. The flat roof of the extension would appear incongruous, alien and visually intrusive, in relation to the form of the other terraced properties in this row of houses. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, the row of terraced properties and the surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1 & DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017).