

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0283
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	48 Mount Pleasant Crescent, Hornsey, London, N4 4HP
Proposal	Lowering pitch of roof to existing loft conversion with dormer window and roof terrace.
Case Officer	Zara Seelig
Valid Date	27/01/2023
Applicant	mr Felix Tanzer
Agent	

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

Site Description

The site is a two-storey mid terraced dwelling situated on the Eastern side of Mount Pleasant Crescent. The site is located within the Stroud Conservation Area, it is a locally listed building, there are no TPO's on the site.

Description of Development

The proposal is for the lowering pitch of roof to existing loft conversion with dormer window and roof terrace (linked to works allowed under planning reference HGY/2019/3247).

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

Planning:

OLD/1981/0825 - Rebuilding and enlarging existing two storey rear extension. – Granted permission

HGY/2019/3247 - Construction of rear dormer window, raising ridge towards rear of building and creation of roof terrace and associated balustrade on flat roof of existing outrigger – Granted permission

HGY/2019/3248 - Construction of ground floor rear infill and rear extension to outrigger. – Granted permission

HGY/2020/1425 - Raising ridge towards rear of building and creation of roof terrace with associated balustrade on flat roof of existing outrigger and rear dormer roof extension (dormer widened from that granted permission under HGY/2019/3247) – Withdrawn

HGY/2021/0748 - Variation of Condition 2 (approved drawings) of planning permission HGY/2019/3247 to raise the ridge height of the roof and corresponding height of rear

dormer. – Refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal. The main issues raised in the appeal are outlined below.

- There is a slight variation in the height of eaves and ridges with some of the properties. While these modest inconsistencies do not detract from the cohesive nature of the terrace, the general uniformity of these properties and their relationship to each other within the crescent, contribute to the significance of the CA as a heritage asset.
- While the height difference is obvious, the resultant build draws the eye primarily due to the steeper angle of the roof slope which is at odds with others in the terrace.
- This is emphasised by the angle of the roof with the parapet wall particularly between Nos. 48 and 50.
- The realignment of the roof has left a much reduced visible parapet which also appears discordant against the backdrop of neighbouring roofs
- Given the distinctive and relatively uniform character and appearance of these properties, the changes undermine the designated status of the crescent as they detract from the original design.
- In this respect the development is materially harmful to the character and appearance of the property and its immediate surroundings within the CA.

Enforcement:

DEP/2020/00339 - Failure to comply with approved drawings on planning permission – Enforcement notice issued with conditions of compliance as follows:

1. Reduce the height of the roof ridgeline and return the roof to its original condition.
2. Reduce the angle of the front roof slope and return the roof to its original condition.
3. Remove from the land any debris resulting from carrying out steps 1 and 2 above.

The enforcement notice was appealed under grounds (f) and (g) and was subsequently dismissed.

Consultation Response

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

LBH Conservation Officer: Consulted – no response received

External: None

Local Representations

The application has been publicised by way of a site notice and 8 neighbour consultation letters.

No of individual responses: none

Objecting: 17

Supporting: 10

Neither: 0

The following local groups/societies were consulted:

- None

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:

- Roofline hasn't been lowered
- The proposal is exactly what was previously refused
- Out of character
- Detracts from the original design and uniformity
- Adversely impacts the Conservation Area
- Adversely impacts the street-scene
- Dominant
- Roof terrace will result in loss of privacy

Material Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

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

Design and Appearance and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

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, 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 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 and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

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.

The proposal is to push the steel back and restore the pitch of the roof to the front elevation and reduce the pitch of the roof and parapet to the front elevation to match the original. Although the ridge height will remain the same, the main concerns, as set out in the appeal decision, summarised above, related to the steeper angle of the roof and the angle of the roof in relation to the parapet. Equally in considering this application it is important to note that consent was already granted under planning reference HGY/2019/3247 in 2020 to allow the roof ridge to be increased.

While accepting the roof ridge is higher than the adjoining properties, the proposal pushes the ridge of the roof back to enable the original pitch of the roof to be restored. This change coupled with the correcting of the roof pitch will result in a more sensitive roof form to this property, to ensure that the character and appearance of these properties and their contribution to the conservation area are preserved, a matter which has been given considerable importance in considering this application.

Discussions were also had with the Enforcement Officer responsible for the enforcement case and the officer agreed that the proposed works would result in a satisfactory remediation to comply with the enforcement notice.

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.

Concerns have been raised regarding the roof terrace, a roof terrace was previously approved under HGY/2019/3247, with the Officer's report stating:

"The terrace would have a depth that would not be significantly greater than a standard balcony and would be set-in from the flank wall of the outrigger. It is considered that this, coupled with the oblique angle of view of the terrace from the first-floor window of No 46 mean that there aren't significant opportunities for overlooking or a need for high screen, which could look overbearing. The roof of the outrigger serving No.50 is higher than that of the host dwelling and there are no windows immediately adjacent to this part of the terrace. There will be no material loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. The proposal is acceptable in amenity terms."

Similar to the 2020 consent the proposal here is considered acceptable and will not adversely affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, compliant with the policies outlined above.

Conclusion

Bearing in mind the outcome of the appeal decision and the 2020 consent, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design, impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and impact on neighbouring amenity and complies with relevant planning policies outlined above.

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.

Recommendation

Grant Permission with conditions:

Conditions:

- 1 The works to which this permission relates shall have been completed within 6 months of the date of this consent, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: This condition is imposed to address the current planning breach and to protect visual amenity and the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area.

- 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: 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.

- **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.