



Officer Report

Application Number: HGY/2023/1644
Application Type: Householder planning permission
Address: First Floor Flat, 166 Victoria Road, Wood Green, London, N22 7XQ
Proposal: Erection of rear dormer roof extension with associated rear roof terrace and increase in ridge height to align with neighbouring property, along with associated alterations and refurbishment of the property.
Case Officer: Sarah Madondo
Valid Date: 02/07/2023
Applicant: Alessandro Piccininno
Agent:

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

Proposed development

Erection of rear dormer roof extension with associated rear roof terrace and increase in ridge height to align with neighbouring property, no 168. First floor Internal alternation and refurbishment.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is two storey mid terraced property located on Victoria Road. The property has been converted into two flats and works relate to the first floor flat. The site is not any conservation area and nor is it listed.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2023/0267 166 Victoria Road Wood Green London N22 Certificate of lawfulness for use of property as two flats APPROVED

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of x site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and x 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:
Objecting: 11
Supporting: 0

The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application:

Out of character (*Officer Comments: Officers consider that the proposed alterations are common developments found in urban areas and therefore the proposed roofs alternations are not considered to be out of character. A number of example of rear dormers have already been approved in the area, therefore the proposal would blend in with similar developments*).

Loss of privacy (*Officer Comments: In terms of loss of privacy the amended drawings show that the privacy screen along the side facing no.168 & 170 would minimise overlooking into the rear gardens of the neighbouring properties. The roof terrace is a very modest addition and setback on the boundary of no. 168. In addition the roof terrace would been significantly pulled back from the rear outrigger to prevent overlooking into the rear gardens of Clifton Road, it is considered that overlooking or loss of privacy has been reduced. Given that there also vegetation in the some of the rear gardens on Clifton Gardens the views here would be partially screened by the vegetation*).

Scale/bulk (*Officer Comment: The proposed dormer and roof terrace have been amended, reducing the scale/bulk of the dormer on the outrigger. Furthermore the half of the outrigger would be retained resulting in roof alterations that would not appear too dominant*).

Loss of light (*Officer Comments: Given the setback from the boundary of no. 168 and setback from the edges of the rear outrigger it is considered that the modest nature of the proposed development on the outrigger would not have significant impact on the amount of daylight/sunlight received by the neighbouring properties. As stated previously the proposed roof dormers do fall under permitted development as such it is not considered that the loss of light would not be too significant. Officers consider that the proposal has been amended as such the impact has been minimized*).

Design (*Officer Comment: The area is characterized by similar developments therefore it is considered that in design terms the proposal is acceptable*).

Over-development (*Officer Comment: Roof extensions are common type of development permitted by the government as result it is not considered that the proposed development would be over-development*).

Overbearing (*Officer Comments: Given that the roof alteration on the outrigger has been setback and would only occupy half the depth of the outrigger, it considered that the roof alterations here would not result in overbearing effect. In addition the setback on the outrigger would result in the retention of the gap between no. 168 & 166 thereby minimizing the impact*).

Overlooking (*Officer Comments: In terms of overlooking it is considered that the rear gardens are already overlooked by first windows as result it is considered that the dormers would not be any different. In terms of the roof terrace, screens have been incorporated to minimize any overlooking, in addition the roof terrace would be for private use and would be limited by weather conditions. Equally, it is noted the roof terrace are part of the character of the area and a number of them have been approved*).

Increasing ridge height (*Officer Comments: There are variations in ridges heights on this street, therefore it is considered that raising the ridge height of no. 166 would match the existing ridge height of no. 168 as it appears to be slightly higher. Furthermore, the proposed dormer would be below the ridge therefore would not be that noticeable at the front elevation*).

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATION

- Design and appearance
- Impact on neighbouring amenity

Design and appearance

Rear Dormer

The proposal is for the erection of a rear dormer including a dormer on the rear outrigger with a roof terrace to provide an additional bedroom plus study and some amenity space for the top floor flat. The application has been amended since submission such that the dormer on the outrigger and roof terrace has been stepped in by approximately 500 mm from the boundary with no. 168. The dormer plus the roof roof would only occupy approximately half of the outrigger as such reducing the dominance of the proposed development on the roof. The proposed rear dormer would be set below the ridge and above the eaves of the main roof, and so it would appear subordinate to the main roof. Its location at the rear would mean that it would not be visible from the street scene, so it would not appear incongruous and detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property or the surrounding area.

The proposed rear dormers are reflective in scale and character of other existing rear dormers along the terrace. The Council consider the proposed rear dormers to be acceptable with regards to its impact on the character and appearance of the street scene.

Roof Terrace

The proposed roof terrace would be sufficiently setback from the edges of the outrigger. It would comprise 1.7m high privacy screen along the boundary with no.168 to prevent overlooking into their rear dormer window. The amended plans shows that the roof terrace would be set back from the boundary with no. 168 and setback from the rear outrigger and so it is considered to be proportionate and subordinate to the host building.

Raising the ridge

The proposal also includes raising of the ridge line of the host property to match no. 168 Victoria Road. There is a variation in the ridge line as the road slopes downward and it does not appear to be consistent along this street given that the road is higher in some parts. As per drawing no. 155_05_102, it is demonstrated that whilst the road has a descending slope, the ridge line does not always follow the same slope as the road. Specifically, no 176, 174 and 172 have similar ridge height; same for no 156, 154 and 152. In addition, to the left of no. 166, the ridge line goes up and down then up (no. 170, 168 & 180). Therefore, it is considered that there is no consistency in the ridge heights. Officers consider the host property appears to have lower ridge height than no. 168 therefore raising the ridge height to match this property is considered acceptable. The alteration in ridge position would not appear noticeable from the street scene. As such, the proposal would preserve the existing character of the street scene.

Impact on the neighbouring properties

As stated previously the dormer on the outrigger would be setback away from the boundary with no. 168, therefore it is considered that the impact on the neighbouring property would not be that significant.

Given the existing degrees of mutual overlooking from first floor windows the degree of additional overlooking created by the dormer is not significant. Overall, the proposed roof extension would not result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight, or have an overbearing appearance to the neighbouring property. There will be no material loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. The proposal is acceptable in amenity terms.

Conclusion

The development would preserve the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026 (2017), Policy D6 of The London Plan 2021, and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2017) which together require development to be of high quality design and to respect the character of the local area.

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 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 obscure glazed privacy screen as shown in the approved plans shall be installed prior to the first use of the roof terrace and retained as such thereafter in perpetuity, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the 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: 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.

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: 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.

