

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1997
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	Flat 2, 60 Hornsey Park Road, Wood Green, London, N8 0JY
Proposal:	Erection of rear roof terrace
Case Officer:	Cameron Sturges
Valid Date:	24/07/2023
	3
Applicant:	Mr Bakhtiyar Barham
Agent:	Mr George Kain

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 The application has been publicised by way of 18 letters to neighbouring properties. 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: 2

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:

- Loss of privacy from overlooking; and
- Noise generated from use of roof terrace.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

The subject site is a first floor flat in a subdivided mid-terrace building. The proposed development is for a roof terrace and frosted glass railing. 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

3.1 The planning and enforcement history of the site is outlined below:

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Design & Appearance; and
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and Appearance

4.2 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.

4.3 Some of the adjoining properties in the immediate locality to the host property have been altered and extended; however, the area has generally retained its original urban form and character. The property has recently been granted approval for the installation of a rear dormer to the roof and an extension above the rear outrigger (HGY/2023/0018). The extension above the rear outrigger takes up nearly half of the depth of the outrigger. Moreover, the dormer on the main roof and extension above the outrigger has already eroded the simple roofscape of the host property.

4.4 The cumulative effect of the rear dormer, extension and proposed roof terrace including the balustrade would not appear subordinate. The somewhat solid appearance of the balustrade's 1.7m high frosted 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 this locality.

4.5 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

4.6 For the reasons set out above, the proposed scheme is at odds with Policy DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017), Local Plan Policy SP11 and London Plan 2021 Policy D6.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

4.7 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.

4.8 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.

4.9 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 proposed roof terrace/balcony would introduce a significantly more intrusive form of overlooking than would normally be expected in such a suburban residential setting. Such overlooking would have an unacceptable impact on the privacy enjoyed by occupants of surrounding residential properties.

4.10 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.

4.11 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. Even with the additional balustrade, neighbours at Nos. 58 and 62 Hornsey Park Road would be aware of there being direct views available from the terrace towards their rear windows and rear garden areas.

4.12 The proposed roof terrace would therefore be harmful to the amenity of neighbouring properties. The scheme is at odds with London Plan Policy D6 and DPD Policy DM1.

Conclusion

4.13 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).

4.14 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)

4.15 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

Based on the information given on the plans, the total additional GIA is less than 100sqm and is not liable for the Mayoral CIL charge or Haringey CIL charge.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

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).

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)