

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1148
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	36 Church Vale, Hornsey, London, N2 9PA
Proposal:	Erection of a two-storey side extension with single storey ground floor extension, hip-to-gable roof conversion with rear dormer roof extension. Installation of 3no. rooflights to front slope. Erection of first floor rear extension.
Case Officer:	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date:	01/05/2026
Applicant:	6 MS RUDINA GANAJ
Agent:	Mr Fatlum Azemi

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the east side of Church Vale. The area is residential in nature, with buildings being built in a variety of styles, with other dwellings that have been extended by way of two storey side extensions. The site does not fall within any conservation area, nor does it affect the setting of any listed building.

2. THE PROPOSAL

This proposal incorporates elements of previously approved permissions HGY/2025/1580 (two storey side and single storey rear extensions), HGY/2025/2159 (single storey rear extension under prior approval), and HGY/2025/2669 (two-storey side with gable end, single storey rear extension, rear dormer extension) which are seen to be fall back positions for those approved elements, however this proposal also incorporates a first floor rear extension along with the other elements. The planning history summary for the site can be seen below.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

Planning History is as follows:

- HGY/2008/0150 | Tree works to include removal of 1 x Poplar (Hybrid) tree.
Approve w/ conditions

- HGY/2025/0534 | Erection of single storey extension which extends beyond the rear wall of the original house by 6m, for which the maximum height would be 3.15m and for which the height of the eaves would be 3m

Refuse

- HGY/2025/1580 | Erection of a two-storey side extension with single storey ground floor extension.

Approve w/ conditions

- HGY/2025/2159 | Erection of a Single Storey Rear Extension part 5m, part 3m in depth with an eaves height of 2.5m

Approve w/ conditions

- HGY/2025/2669 | Erection of a two-storey side extension with single storey ground floor extension, hip-to-gable roof conversion with rear dormer roof extension. Installation of 3no. rooflights to front slope.

Approve w/ conditions

Enforcement history is as follows:

ENF/2026/0725 | Tree Works | The protected trees in the back garden have been felled and replaced with a concrete slab

Closed - no breach

ENF/2026/0751 | Unauthorised Works - Boundary Treatment | Large area of the rear garden has been cemented over

Under investigation - triage

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Neighbour Consultation

The application was advertised by way of letters sent to neighbouring properties. The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 4

Objecting: 4

The following issues were raised in representations and are addressed further on in this report or below:

- Cumulative overdevelopment
- Privacy and perception of overlooking
- Out of character with houses in surrounding area
- Overbearing Impact
- Creation of a sense of enclosure
- Light disturbance from skylights
- Adverse impact from construction traffic

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & appearance

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD both aim to enhance the built environment through high quality design that respects local context and positive aspects of the area. Policy DM1 sets out that development should relate positively to its locality in terms of building height, form, scale, massing, building lines and architectural details and styles.

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 and 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.

This proposal is a modified resubmission of previously approved permissions (HGY/2025/1580, HGY/2025/2159, and HGY/2025/2669), which comprised of a two-storey side extension with gable end feature, a large single storey side to rear and rear ground floor rear extension and a large rear dormer. The current proposal would add a first-floor rear extension to the other previously approved additions. The previously approved extensions for the two-storey side extension with gable end, single storey side to rear and rear extensions, and rear dormer as approved, are taken to be a fallback position in the assessment of this planning application.

Notwithstanding this, the already approved elements of this proposal will be assessed below alongside the amended roof form and dormer roof extension.

It is noted that within the objections raised, residents highlighted that this proposal would not be able to be implemented alongside HGY/2025/1580 (Erection of a two-storey side extension with single storey ground floor extension) and could result in cumulative overdevelopment if implemented alongside HGY/2025/2159 (Erection of a Single Storey Rear Extension part 5m, part 3m in depth with an eaves height of 2.5m).

This proposal therefore incorporates elements of the already approved side extension, which is taken as a fallback position for the principle of a two-storey side extension. This was included such that the amended roof form and incorporation of rear dormer could be assessed.

With respect to over development, there are a number of sites in the area, such as No. 20 and 28 Church Vale, that have two-storey side extensions and have changed the roof form to the side as well as having full width side-to-rear extensions at ground floor level. An issue does arise however when the bulk of the first floor rear extension (explored below) is considered amongst each of these other additions.

Two-storey extension

The site currently has a single storey garage structure along the boundary with No. 38 Church Vale. This structure is 2.73m in height, with a depth of 8.94m and being set back from the front elevation by 2.79m.

The proposed two-storey side extension would be 3.55m wide at ground floor level, and 2.43m wide at first floor level, being set in from the boundary by 1m. The side infill would abut the front elevation of the original dwelling being 11.89m deep. It is noted that the application site has a prominent two-storey gable projection with double height bay window with overhanging roof, that would protrude out further than the infill extension, helping it to appear subordinate.

The extension would directly abut the boundary with No. 38 Church Vale at ground floor level and would extend 11.89m on the shared boundary.

A number of the objections raised highlighted that the development would have an adverse impact on the character of the area, with the change in roof form being incongruent with the architectural style in the area. These objections also stated that the proposal would appear overly bulky. It is noted that a large number of buildings on the same side of the road have two storey side extensions, and of note Nos 20, 28, and 32 have two storey side extensions at a similar scale to the proposal, with a variety of different roof forms.

The gable roof form was previously approved under planning reference HGY/2025/2669. The roof of the proposed new gable end would step downward from the height of the original ridge, helping the new roof to appear as a subordinate addition to the site.

It is considered that the set in from the boundary of the upper floor section of 1m, along with the infill appearing as if set back from the front of the house by the existing overhanging roof and bay window lead the proposed extension to appear sufficiently subordinate to the host building. Additionally, given the established precedent of two storey side extensions in the area, such as at Nos. Nos 20, 28, and 32 Church Vale, the implementation of a two-storey side extension would be acceptable.

Dormer Roof Extension

The proposed rear dormer would be 7.2m wide and 3.58m deep. It would have a height of 2.94m. The dormer would be set in 0.40m from the side parapet of the original roof, and 800mm down from the original ridge line. The dormer would be positioned off-centre within the extended rear roof plane, 2.72m from the side edge of the proposed side extension roof.

This dormer would be finished in similar materials to the existing roof and would have a full height set of sliding doors complete with a Juliet balcony.

Officers deem that the dormer would be adequately set in from the edges of the existing roof slope and therefore would appear adequately subordinate to the host dwelling. It is noted that there are larger dormers in place within Church Vale.

As such, on balance, the addition of a dormer roof extension is deemed to be acceptable and the proposal would generally follow the pattern of development in the area, appearing adequately subordinate to the host building.

First floor rear extension

Of note with this application along with the other previously approved elements would be the proposed addition of a first-floor rear extension 3m in depth and 6.33m in width at a height of 2.86m. This first-floor element would be more than half the width of the extended dwellinghouse and would be close to the maximum width of the original house. It would also extend more than half the depth rearward of the approved rear projection under HGY/2025/2159. The extension would have a flat roof design set at the eaves height of the original dwelling.

When considering what is already approved on site, and that it would not be possible to erect the first floor extension without building out the previously approved side and rear additions (unless a cantilevered addition was proposed), it is considered that this proposal would constitute an overdevelopment of the site that would be out of character with the surrounding area that would fail to appear subordinate to the host dwellinghouse contrary to Local Plan Policy SP11 and Development Management DPD Policies DM1 and DM12.

The cumulative development of the site including the first floor rear extension would be excessive, with the approved development under previous applications (planning references HGY/2025/1580, HGY/2025/2159, and HGY/2025/2669) being considered to be reaching a threshold beyond which

further additions to the dwelling would represent an overdevelopment that would fail to respect the scale, form and character of the host building. The proposal is therefore considered to be unacceptable with regards to design and character considerations.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

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.

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 the amenity of neighbouring residents.

As noted above, this proposal presents a resubmission of a number of previously approved elements such as a two-storey side extension, hip-to-gable roof conversion with formation of rear dormer, and ground floor rear extension (approved under permissions HGY/2025/1580, HGY/2025/2159, and HGY/2025/2669). These previously approved permissions were considered to be acceptable in amenity terms by virtue of measures taken within them to distance elements from the boundary or reduce eaves heights.

Inclusive with this proposal would be a first-floor rear extension and an obscure glazed window within the two-storey side extension facing the side boundary shared with No. 38 Church Vale. As noted above the two-storey rear extension would be 3m in depth and 6.33m in width at a height of 2.86m. It would be positioned closest to No. 38 and is shown on drawing 36CV-BP01 not to project any further than the existing rear outrigger of No. 38.

A number of objections were submitted in relation to this proposal, with specific material concerns being as follows:

- Cumulative overdevelopment
- Privacy and perception of overlooking
- Out of character with houses in surrounding area
- Overbearing Impact
- Creation of a sense of enclosure
- Light disturbance from skylights
- Adverse impact from construction traffic

The proposed obscure glazed side facing window would not result in any loss to neighbouring amenity. The application site already has a significant amount of non-obscure glazing on its side elevation. Therefore, whilst this window would be in closer proximity to the side boundary of no. 38, it would be obscure glazed and would present a reduction in side facing glazing at upper floor level in comparison to the existing situation on site, that would not adversely impact the amenities of No. 38.

The skylight arrangement to the ground floor extension approved under HGY/2025/2159 has been amended with this proposal and would see an increase in their number. The space served by these skylights is shown to be a large kitchen/living room. It is not considered there the inclusion of the rooflights would result in an unacceptable impact on light pollution conditions of neighbouring occupants that would warrant refusal of the application.

The first-floor rear extension would be positioned most closely to No. 38 Church Vale and would not project beyond the extent of the existing adjacent two-storey rear projection of No. 38, not projecting beyond a line drawn at 45 degrees out from any adjacent neighbouring habitable windows.

For the reasons set out above it is considered that the proposed first-floor rear extension would not have any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity, as it would be positioned such that it would not result in an unacceptable loss of light, outlook or sense of enclosure, or loss of privacy on the occupants of No. 38 Church Vale.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed development is not in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policies SP11 and of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also fails to accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

The proposal is considered unacceptable in respect of its scale, bulk and massing and would result in a cumulative overdevelopment of the site that would fail to appear subordinate or follow the pattern of development in the area. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application should be refused for the following reason:

Refusal Reasons:

By virtue of their excessive bulk, scale and massing, the proposed additions would cumulatively constitute an overdevelopment of the site that would be out of character with the surrounding area, and would fail respect the scale, form and character of the host building, failing to appear subordinate in scale, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).