



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1582
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	104 Beresford Road, Hornsey, London, N8 0AH
Proposal:	Roof terrace to part of rear. Annex pitched roof.
Case Officer:	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date:	15/06/2023
Applicant:	Mr Edward Dewhirst
Agent:	Hale Design Studio - Mr Peter Charman

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

1.1 This is an application for the formation of a roof terrace to provide private amenity space to the first floor flat. The proposed roof terrace would be located on top of the existing two-storey outrigger, where the existing roof slope would be removed to create a flat roof onto which the terrace is proposed. An existing window would be replaced with a door to allow access. A balustrade of 1.7m would be positioned around the edge of the terrace.

Site and Surroundings

1.2 The application property is a two-storey located on the southern side of Beresford Road. It is located on a terrace of other residential properties, many of which have been extended and altered. The surrounding area is wholly residential in character.

1.3 The property is not located within a Conservation Area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

- HGY/2022/4700 - Granted 28/04/2023 - Single storey ground floor side and rear infill extension. Loft conversion with a rear dormer window on the main roof and the out-riiger roof slopes

1.5 There is no enforcement planning history in relation to the site.

2. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 The application has been publicised by way of 32 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 1
Objecting: 1
Supporting: 0

2.2 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:

- Objection to the proposal on the basis of intrusion on privacy. Proposal would result in occupiers constantly overlooked by those using the proposed roof terrace.

3. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Impact on the character and appearance of the area.
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and appearance

3.2 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.

3.3 Some of the adjoining properties in the locality have been altered and extended; however, the area has generally retained its original urban form and character. There is existing box dormer window at rear of the main roof slope extending onto the rear outrigger projection at the host property and occupies a substantial portion of the main roof. This dormer on the main roof and outrigger has already eroded the simple roofscape of the host property.

3.4 The cumulative effect of the existing rear dormer and proposed roof terrace including the balustrade would not appear subordinate. The somewhat solid appearance of the balustrade's 1.7m high obscure glazing would also visually read as adding considerable bulk. As such, as a consequence of its bulk and massing, form and location. It would dominate the rear of the property and be at odds with the established traditional roof form which is predominant in the locality.

3.5 Therefore, as a whole, the proposal would unduly dominate the outrigger's simple two storey pitched roof form. Furthermore, as it would project beyond the typical depth of the dormer extensions found in the locality, the roof of the outrigger would appear uncharacteristically bulky within the context of the wider roofscape. Although the scheme would largely be screened from the public realm, owing to its prominent high-level position the incongruous relationship with the building and the roofscape would be discernible in private views from the rear of many of the surrounding residential properties, which amount to a legitimate matter of public interest.

3.6 In light of the above, the development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

3.7 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.

3.8 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.

3.9 The application property is situated in a relatively confined space with other residential properties, including those to either side, below and to the rear. The existing outrigger to 106 Beresford Road and the siting of properties in rear and adjoining give a particularly close relationship with the host property.

3.10 The proposed roof terrace would occupy an elevated position on top of the existing outrigger. This siting, when combined with the height and transparency of the balustrade would allow unobstructed views into neighbouring gardens and properties. The nature and position of the the proposed roof terrace/balcony would introduce a significantly more intrusive form of overlooking than would normally be expected in a such a suburban residential setting. Such overlooking would have an unacceptable impact on the privacy enjoyed by occupants of surrounding residential properties.

3.11 It is considered that the wider neighbouring occupiers would still have a greater perception of being looked down upon from a high vantage point when in their rear garden area with the proposed development, particularly as the gardens are relatively narrow. The proposal would therefore detract from their enjoyment of their properties and add to the harm identified above.

3.12 The roof terrace/balcony on the rear/side boundary would be reliant on the 1.7m high privacy screen to be considered acceptable however without this the proposal would result in loss of privacy and overlooking into neighbouring properties.

3.13 Many of the potential angles of view would be quite penetrating, leading to an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupants of these neighbouring properties and resulting in a significant reduction of the enjoyment of spaces within them below the standard that their residents should reasonably expect to enjoy. Although the applicant has attempted to ease this problem by proposed balustrades, this measure would not prevent overlooking and views into the gardens and neighbouring windows of adjoining properties. Although the balustrade would feature obscure glazing 1.7m in height, there would be narrow vertical gaps between the glazed panels and the metal supports, such that neighbouring occupiers, particularly those at Nos. 102 and 106 Beresford Road would be aware of there being direct views available from the terrace towards their rear windows and rear garden areas.

3.14 There are no conditions that would make the proposed terrace to be acceptable, but which would remain reasonable in all respects and satisfy the guidance for conditions in the council's adopted policies.

Conclusion

3.15 The proposed roof terrace with balustrade screening by reason of its elevated prominent position would be a visually intrusive addition when viewed from adjoining properties and facilitate overlooking of the adjoining properties resulting in loss of privacy to neighbouring occupants, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (adopted 2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

3.16 The proposed roof terrace with screening over the existing outrigger would appear as a visually prominent bulky and incongruous addition to the rear of the building, would appear uncharacteristically bulky within the context of the wider roofscape to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, as such contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (adopted 2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

3.17 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.

4. 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.

5. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed roof terrace with balustrade screening by reason of its elevated prominent position would be a visually intrusive addition when viewed from adjoining properties and would introduce an unacceptable level of additional overlooking of the adjoining properties resulting in a loss of privacy detrimental to the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers, contrary to Policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management, Development Plan Document (2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

The proposed roof terrace and screening would take up the majority of the remaining original outrigger roof, and would appear as a visually prominent, overly bulky and incongruous addition, failing to achieve an appropriate level of subordination within the context of the wider roofscape, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area, contrary to Policy DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management, Development Plan Document (2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).