

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/3849
Type	Full planning permission
Location	Flat C, 56 Upper Tollington Park, Hornsey, London, N4 4BX
Proposal	Installation of rear dormer window, addition of two front rooflights, replacement of second floor windows and re-roofing with natural slates.
Case Officer	James Mead
Valid Date	21/10/2022
Applicant	Ms. Jenny Lynn Walsh
Agent	Mr Marek Redo

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

2.1 This is an application for the proposed installation of a rear dormer window, the addition of front rooflights and the replacement of second floor windows. The proposal also includes the re-roofing of the main roof of the property.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is occupied by a three storey, mid-terrace Victorian property, which is in use as three separate flats. This current application relates to the second floor flat. The building sits on the south-eastern side of Upper Tollington Park and close to the junction with Florence Road. The setting is residential in character, being predominantly made up of terraced properties of similar architectural style. The site is within the Stroud Green Conservation Area (CA) and officers consider that this row of properties, including the host building, positively contribute to the character of the CA.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

2.3 The most recent planning history relating to the site is as follows:

- HGY/2022/1912: Erection of a single storey side in-fill extension at 56A Upper Tollington Park. Approved with conditions.
- HGY/2020/2357: Replacement of 2 first floor timber sash windows with replacement UPVC sash units. Refused.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

1) LBH Conservation Officer: Objects to the application. The replacement of the existing UPVC windows is welcomed. The reinstatement of traditional materials, such as timber, is considered to enhance the character of the Stroud Green CA. However, there are concerns regarding the proposed rooflights to the street-facing roof slope. Rooflights are incongruous features within historic streetscapes and are not considered acceptable in CAs. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a precedent for rooflights in the surrounding area, it is incumbent upon Local Planning Authorities to ensure that negative or intrusive features within CAs do not become prevalent. There are also concerns regarding the proposed rear-facing dormer window. The existing terrace has a largely unaltered roofscape, which makes a positive contribution to the Stroud Green CA. As rear dormers are not characteristic of this terrace, the introduction of the dormer is not considered an appropriate addition.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 32 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: 1

Objecting: 1

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 dormer window would significantly change the look of the property, having a detrimental effect on the character of the house and the surrounding area.

4.3 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- Notification letters were received late, therefore it is not felt that sufficient time for comment has been given for neighbours to comment. Officers note this comment but are satisfied that they have met the statutory notification requirements for this application. The time given to neighbours to respond takes into account the likely time taken for the letter to be delivered. In addition a site notice was put up adjacent to the site giving potential interested parties 21 days to provide comments, from the date the notice was put up.. Sufficient time has passed since the close of the consultation period, and therefore adequate time has been allowed for any further comments.

- The application is not on your map of current applications – officers note this comment, however the application is viewable on the relevant map.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Design, Appearance & Heritage;
2. Neighbour Amenity; and
3. Heritage Balance.

Design, Appearance & Heritage

5.2 London Plan Policy D3 outlines that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites. Local Plan Policy SP11 notes that development should be of the highest standard of design that respects local context, character

and historic significance, so to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. Similarly, DPD Policy DM1 requires all new development to achieve a high standard of design. Proposals should relate positively to their locality having regard to: building heights, form, scale, massing, urban grain, building lines, plot/building widths, distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials. DM DPD Policy DM12 outlines that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, should be of a high, site-specific and sensitive design quality and should respect the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of original buildings.

5.3 In regard to proposals in CAs, the Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to ensure that that the historic significance of these heritage assets is preserved or enhanced. London Plan Policy HC1 requires developments to conserve the significance of heritage assets by being sympathetic to the assets significance and appreciation within the surroundings. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 note that proposals should ensure the conservation of the historic significance of heritage assets and their setting. The preservation of the historic form, function and character of CAs should be secured, in accordance with DPD Policy DM9.

Rear Dormer

5.4 It is proposed to install a flat roof dormer window on the rear roof slope of the host property. This dormer would be of substantial width and height, and therefore would cover the majority of the rear roof slope. Due to the significant proportions of the dormer, in relation to the size of the roof slope, it is considered that this roof addition would appear as a bulky and dominant feature on the rear elevation. As such, the dormer would overwhelm the rear roof slope and would fail to be sufficiently subordinate to the existing property and would appear an uncomplimentary and obtrusive addition.

5.5 The host property is situated in a prominent position in the CA, with the rear elevation highly visible from Florence Road. This property, together with the majority of properties in this row, have unaltered rear roof slopes. The unaltered form of these existing roof slopes is sympathetic to the CA location and ensures that these properties do not appear intrusive in views taken from Florence Road. The proposal would change this, with a bulky dormer installed in a highly prominent location. The high visibility of the proposed dormer, taken together with the substantial scale of the roof extension, means that the addition would overly dominate this stretch of terraced properties. The proposed dormer would appear overly bulky in views from Florence Road and would dominate this part of the CA. Officers views on this inappropriate and unsympathetic roof addition are backed up by the comments of the Conservation Officer, who has objected to the proposal. It is considered that the dormer would be of inappropriate size, scale, siting and massing. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, the street scene and the CA. The historic significance and special interest of the CA would not be preserved. The proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies D3 & HC1, Local Plan Policies SP11 & SP12 and DM DPD Policies DM1, DM9 & DM12.

5.6 It is noted that some rear dormers have been permitted in this part of the Stroud Green CA. There is a rear dormer present at 48 Upper Tollington Park. However, this dormer is of lesser scale than the roof addition proposed in this current application. Furthermore, this existing dormer is not in such a prominent location when compared with 56 Upper Tollington Park. Therefore, the existence of this dormer does not materially weigh in favour of the proposal. A similarly proportioned dormer at 73 Upper Tollington Park was allowed at appeal. However, this dormer was set-down slightly from the ridge of this property, affording some subservience. In addition, some views of the dormer at 73 Upper Tollington Park are at least screened from the public realm at certain times of year by the existence of trees on Florence Road. Given these observations, it is not considered that the appeal at 73 Upper Tollington Park forms the basis for allowing the bulky dormer proposed through this application.

Rooflights

5.7 The scheme also proposes the addition of two rooflights onto the front roof slope of the property. It is noted that the Conservation Officer has raised concern with these rooflights. However, officers note that there are numerous properties in the locality that incorporate front rooflights. Noting this, and given the modest proportions of the rooflights, it is not considered that these additions would appear overly incongruous or intrusive. However, if this application were to be approved, a condition would be recommended requiring the rooflights to be conservation type, so to ensure that the additions would be sympathetic to the CA location.

Replacement of Windows & Re-Roofing

5.8 It is proposed to replace existing UPVC windows on the front and rear elevations, with new timber windows. The existing UPVC windows are of modern nature and the frames are somewhat bulky. As such, these windows are not of traditional form and are not sympathetic to the CA location. On the other hand, the timber construction of the replacement windows would be of traditional nature, appropriate for use in a CA. Therefore, the incorporation of the replacement windows would elevate the appearance of the property. The submitted plans also indicate that re-roofing is proposed. There is no objection to this, however, if this application were to be approved a condition would be recommended securing details of the new slates.

Neighbour Amenity

5.9 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 the context, while also minimising overshadowing. Furthermore, DM 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.

5.10 The siting of the proposed dormer within the main roof slope of the property means that this addition would not result in undue: overbearing impacts, loss of light, overshadowing or restriction of outlook. None of the new windows, replacement windows or rooflights would be sited, so to allow inappropriate overlooking of neighbours. The amenity, living conditions and privacy of all neighbours (Flats A & B 56 Upper Tollington Park, 54 & 58 Upper Tollington Park and Fernbank) would be suitably protected.

Heritage Balance

5.11 A previous section of this report has concluded that the proposed rear dormer would harm the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst this is noted, the localised nature of the impacts means that, in the context of the whole CA, the harm would be 'less than substantial'. In such circumstances, paragraph 202 of the NPPF notes that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the scheme would increase the level of accommodation at Flat C, however this is a benefit of private nature. The scheme would replace unsympathetic UPVC windows with new timber windows, which would be a visual enhancement. However, these works are not reliant on the installation of the rear dormer. As such, these works do not weigh in favour of the rear dormer. Overall, there would be no tangible public benefits arising from the scheme. Therefore, the 'less than substantial' harm to the character of the CA would not be outweighed.

Conclusion

5.12 The proposal is considered unacceptable. The proposed dormer would appear as a bulky and overly large addition to the rear roof slope of the property. Therefore, the dormer would fail to respect the proportions of the existing property and would not be a subservient addition. The proposed dormer would appear bulky in views from Florence Road and would dominate this stretch of terraced properties, as well as this part of the CA. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, the surrounding street scene and the CA. The historic significance and special interest of the CA would not be preserved.

5.13 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 rear dormer, by virtue of its inappropriate size, scale, siting and massing, would appear as an overly large roof addition, which would not be subservient or subordinate to the existing property. The dormer would appear bulky in views from the street scene, whilst also dominating this stretch of terraced properties and this part of the Conservation Area. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, the street scene and the Stroud Green Conservation Area. The special interest and historic significance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D3 & HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 & SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1, DM9 & DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017).