

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1081
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	Flat B, 34 Raleigh Road, Hornsey, London, N8 0HY
Proposal:	Erection rear L-shaped dormer above main roof and rear outrigger, and insertion of 3no. rooflights on front roof slope. Construction of rear second floor roof terrace above outrigger with 1.2m high timber slatted balustrade.
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	23/04/2026
Applicant:	6
Agent:	Mr Rad Naghar

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a first floor level flat in a 2-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the south side of Raleigh Road. The site does not fall within a conservation area nor is within the curtilage of listed building.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal seeks for the erection rear L-shaped dormer above main roof and rear outrigger, and insertion of 3no. rooflights on front roof slope. Construction of rear second floor roof terrace above outrigger with privacy screening.

The L-shaped dormer is measured in two parts. The part above main roof rear slope would have an overall width of 5.09 metres, a height of 1.34 metres and depth of 2.95 metres adjacent to No.36, and around 3.69 metres in height and 2.43 metres in depth adjacent to No.32. The part of the dormer above the outrigger would have a width of 3.00 metres, a height of 2.52 metres, and a depth of 2.90 metres. The dormer would be below the ridge. The L-shaped dormer would accommodate 2no. additional bedrooms and a shower room.

The roof terrace would be 1.9 metres in depth and 2.52 metres in width with separation distances of 0.5 metres from the side boundary and 3.32 metres from the rear wall of the outrigger. The height of the privacy screen and rear balustrade would be 1.2m and the material would be slatted board.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/1989/0127

Address: 34, Raleigh Road, London, N8 0HY, London

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear addition to form new bathroom to ground floor flat.

Decision Date: 10 September 2012

Decision: Not Determined

HGY/2024/1668

Address: Flat A, 34 Raleigh Road, Hornsey, London, N8 0HY

Proposal: Erection of a wraparound single storey rear extension at the ground floor flat.

Decision Date: 20 August 2024

Decision: Approve with Conditions

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Neighbour Consultation

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:

- Roof terrace would introduce new overlooking by facing neighbouring gardens and rear windows.
- Roof terrace would be intrusive and remove any sense of privacy
- The roof dormer is excessive.
- The roof dormer extension would appear visually dominant from surrounding properties.
- The proposal is overly intensive and out of keeping with the character of the neighbouring properties.
- Roof terrace would have an impact on tenants privacy and enjoyment.
- Roof terrace would introduce raised seating and standing allow direct views down into their garden and into the rear rooms of this house.
- The 1.2m high timber balustrade would not provide sufficient screening to prevent overlooking.
- Size and bulk of the L-shaped dormer is too dominant and visually intrusive.
- The L-shaped dormer is excessive for this property.
- Overdevelopment and would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity.
- Impact on their day-to-day living conditions, in relation to privacy and noise
- The ground floor flat was not consulted the statement Certificate B is false whereby the notice was not given, nor within 21 days.
- The additional dormer that creates a 4no. bedroom flat is an overdevelopment and would cause overcrowding.
- The bedroom sizes from the development would be too small.
- The application takes no consideration of the works to be done to extend the ground floor flat.
- The terrace would impact on the privacy of the ground floor flat by directly looking into the new bedroom via the skylight.
- The proposed section A-A indicates that the roof terrace impact would somehow be mitigated by 2 brick courses of parapet on the roof - the reality is that once the additional

roof structure, deck and gradient for drainage is taken into account, this terrace would be sitting much higher than indicated. This would make the impact on the amenity of the garden below and other nearby gardens worse than stated.

- The demise of flat B does not include the attic space nor does it include the roof space where the proposed terrace and additional flat roof room would be situated. Any representation that this is not the case is false. The application therefore includes areas that are not demised and there is no consent from the Freeholder.

Officer response: The part of the L-shaped dormer that is above main roof would be set back from the eaves by 1 metre be set back from the eaves by 1 metres when measure perpendicular from the roof slope. It would also be set in from the sides along rear outrigger. The size of the roof terrace is not considered to be excessive, and it would have a separation distance of 0.5 metres from the eaves on the side of the outrigger and over 3 metres from the rear wall of the outrigger, so it would not be possible to overlook the skylight above the approved rear extension for the ground floor flat under reference HGY/2024/1668.

With regard to Certificate B, the applicant has provided evidence that the owner of the ground floor flat was informed of their plans for the property.

The other objections from the flats at No.36 about the roof terrace have been addressed later in the report.

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.

Rear L-shaped dormer and 3no. front rooflights

The bulk, scale, and amount of glazing in the proposed roof extension and rooflights are considered modest and appropriate. As such, the proposal is considered proportionate and sensitive to the design, character and appearance of this property.

Rear roof terrace

The siting and design of the proposed roof terrace is considered modest and in scale and carefully designed in relation to the appearance of this building and would not be out of keeping with the character of the area considering that there is roof terrace at No.32. It would preserve the existing roof form and complement the elevation on which the proposed roof terrace is located.

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.

Rear L-shaped dormer and 3no. front rooflights

Although objections have been raised about the roof dormer appearing overly dominant, visually intrusive, and excess in size, its scale and massing are considered modest and would not result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight, or have an overbearing appearance to No.31, 33, 35 Hampden Road. The extension would not lead to a material loss of privacy to Nos. 34 and 36, nor the 3no. front rooflights cause overlooking to the properties on the other side of Raleigh Road due to the separation distance. The proposed L-shaped dormer and rooflights are acceptable in amenity terms.

Rear roof terrace

It has also been mentioned that the day-to-day living conditions would have an impact on privacy and cause noise. It is noted that the proposed roof terrace may provide the opportunity for gathering. Given its modest size there would be less likelihood of noise reaching intrusive levels. Although an hours of use condition on external space is often attached in respect of commercial properties, to do so in respect of a residential property would be difficult to enforce and unduly restrictive when the same does not apply neighbouring properties.

There were objections raised about the 1.2m high timber slatted board privacy screen. At this height, it is considered to be low and it is likely that there would be views into the upper windows at No.36, therefore, there would be an adverse impact from the terrace on the privacy of the neighbouring occupants. Therefore, the proposal is unacceptable in terms of the lack of a high privacy screen leading to a loss of privacy.

6. CONCLUSION

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

The proposal is considered acceptable in respect of its character, appearance and impact on the site, but would result in material harm to the residential amenity of neighbours at No.36. 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 is recommended for refusal subject to the following reason:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed roof terrace, by reason of the privacy screen's height, would be unacceptably harmful in terms of loss of privacy to the occupiers of flats at No.36 Raleigh Road, contrary to DPD Policies DM1, DM2, and London Plan Policy D6.

Informatives:

The applicant is advised that a minimum of 1.7m high privacy screen should be designed onto the side facing no. 36. It is not necessary to carry on this height onto the rear side which faces onto the garden, which can be kept at 1.2m high.