



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1788
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	6 Hardy Passage, Wood Green, London, N22 5NZ
Proposal:	New Mansard Roof Over Flat Roof to Convert Front First Floor Flat From a Flat to a 4 Person Maisonette.
Case Officer:	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date:	06/07/2023
Applicant:	Mr JODY LYSTER
Agent:	Mr Richard Loren

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of a second - floor mansard roof extension over the existing roof to provide additional habitable accommodation and modifications to the internal layout of the existing first floor. Proposal would result in the conversion of the existing first floor self-contained flat to 3 beds, 5-person maisonette.

Site and Surroundings

1.2 The application site is two-storey mid terrace property situated in south-western side of Hardy Passage, a narrow road running at the rear of the High Road, Wood Green, adjacent to the rear of the underground station. The property forms part of a row of terraces with flat roof detail. The application site has been converted into two self-contained flat. Application relates to the first floor flat.

1.3 The immediate area is wholly residential in character. However, the wider surrounding along the High Street and Lordship Lane are mainly commercial units on the ground floor with residential accommodation on the upper floor level.

1.4 The site is not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

- HGY/2009/1988 - Granted 15/01/2010 - Addition of small window to side of premises (Retrospective).
- HGY/2009/0010 – Refused 10/02/2009 - Erection of mansard roof to create 1 x studio self-contained flat.
- HGY/2008/2258 – Granted 22/01/2009 - Conversion of property into 2 x two-bedroom self-contained residential units.
- HGY/2008/1462 – Refused 29/08/2008 - Erection of mansard roof to create 1 x one bed self-contained flat.

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

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

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

Internal:

1) LBH Transportation Team: No comments

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

3.1 The application has been publicised by way of 22 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: 9

Objecting: 4

Supporting: 5

3.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Cranbrook Park Residents Association has objected to the scheme on the following grounds: This is at least third Planning Application submitted for this address to have a Mansard Roof Extension. Both previous applications were rejected. It is doubtful that the room sizes conform to the basic minimum size standards. It would only increase the number of poor - quality housing instead of creating new, better housing. Given the planning history – it is noted that proposed layout of the upper two new bedroom is the same configuration as in the previous planning application which was rejected. Proposal would add and exacerbate problems associated with overflowing rubbish/refuse at the end of Hardy Passage and Fly Tipping. Additional floor would increase overlooking and erode privacy, inadequate outdoor amenity space.

3.3 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are summarised and addressed in the next section of this report:

Objections

- Development is not suitable for the area.

- Proposal will increase the demand for on-street parking in an area in which this facility is already lacking.
- Urge the Council to reconsider this proposal and seek ways that align more closely with the aspirations of the Woodgreen community.

Support

- The proposal presents a very generous residential unit. The proximity to the tube means no parking is required.
- It is well set back from Hardy Passage and hence not overbearing. The owner has very respectfully consulted with all the neighbours and taken on board our input.
- Good idea to 'book end' the terrace with the start of Hardy Passage. Note the building R/O 214 High Road, N22 is over 3 floors. I also consider the proposal to be very considerate and progressive in line with the Mayor and London Plan 2021 to build upwards and create more family units.

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Principle of development.
2. Design and appearance.
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Principle of Development

4.2 London Plan (2021) Policy H2A outlines a clear presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) and sets out a minimum target in Table 4.2 for boroughs (Haringey –10-year target is 2,600).

4.3 London Plan Policy D3 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity of existing and future transport services.

4.4 The principle of altering the existing building is acceptable, subject to it having a good design, being subordinate in scale to the existing building and it is having no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area or on the amenities of adjoining occupiers. The proposal would increase the size of an existing small flat to larger family dwellinghouse and is considered acceptable in land use terms.

Design and appearance

4.5 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.

4.6 Hardy Passage is a narrow residential street of predominantly two storey dwellings of uniform design or arranged in small groups of similar character and appearance. The properties are such a group in the form of a short terrace with consistent design features. These include a front parapet, which obscures flat roof, with front windows/door visible from the street.

4.7 The proposal involves a raised mansard style roof extension to the existing flat roof. Due to the extent of the set-back from the front of the roof and the limited width of the street, it would not be possible to see the extension from immediately in front of the terrace. Approaching the terrace from the south, however, there is a highly open aspect to the side of the two properties and it is possible to see the full extent of the roof with the flat roof above the terraced dwellings.

4.8 From this view, the unaltered and consistent appearance of the roofscape is readily apparent. The open, undeveloped roof contributes to the character and appearance of the group and to the quality of the street scene. The addition of development in the form of a raised roof to one part of the terrace would upset its existing uniformity and consistent appearance. Despite the majority of buildings in this part of Smarts Lane being different, most appear to be.

Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

4.9 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.

4.10 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.

4.11 From this view, the unaltered and consistent appearance of the roofscape is readily apparent. The open, undeveloped roof contributes to the character and appearance of the group and to the quality of the street scene. The addition of development in the form of a raised roof to one part of the terrace would upset its existing uniformity and consistent appearance. Despite the majority of buildings in this passage of being different in fenestration, most appear to be unaltered and have retained their original built form. Although no. 16 Hardy Passage is of a different character to the rest of the terrace in terms of its, roofs and façade design - they have a consistent parapet height with application site. In this setting the proposed roof extension would be a prominent and incongruous change which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and street scene.

4.12 There is a currently unbroken row of properties with flat roofs, which define a unifying pattern to the front and rear elevations of this group when viewed from both the small garden area behind and from high level views from surrounding properties within the area. The host building exhibits a completed and balanced composition which an additional storey would interrupt. The proposal for a mansard extension at no. 6 would also harm the character and appearance of the group of terraces.

4.13 Proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it is a part and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to the following policies of the Council's Local Plan and Development Management DPD, concerning sensitive design quality and respecting the character of the buildings which, amongst other matters, which requires residential extensions to complement the street scene. These policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly section seven concerning good design.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

4.14 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.

4.15 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.

4.16 Given the distance between the application site and the properties to the rear of the application site fronting the High Road, it is considered that the proposal will cause a significant increased sense of enclosure to rear of those properties.

4.17 The proposed roof terrace would occupy an elevated position on top of the existing flat. This siting, when combined with the height and transparency of the balustrade would allow unobstructed views into neighbouring gardens and properties fronting High Road. Such overlooking would have an unacceptable impact on the privacy enjoyed by occupants of surrounding residential properties above the shops.

Conclusion

4.18 The proposal is considered acceptable not acceptable. The proposed mansard roof extension by reason of its design, size, scale, and siting would be an incongruous and unsympathetic feature that would harm the character and appearance of the terrace and wider area. The extension would result in an undesirable visual feature when observed from the front/rear and would be harmful to the appearance of the host building. This would set unwanted precedent in the passage that is predominantly two-storey in nature. The proposal is therefore considered to be 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).

4.19 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).

4.20 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.

5. 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.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed mansard roof extension by reason of its design, size, scale, and siting would be an incongruous and unsympathetic feature that would harm the character and appearance of the terrace and wider area. This would set unwanted precedent in the passage that is predominantly two-storey in nature. The proposal is therefore considered to be 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).

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).