



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1466
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	23 Ringwood Avenue, Hornsey, London, N2 9NT
Proposal:	Erection of roof and rear dormer extension; front extension to first floor; 2 no. front rooflights (amended description)
Case Officer:	Nathan Keyte
Valid Date:	26/05/2026
	6
Applicant:	Tony & Cathy Katz
Agent:	Martin Evans

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SITE AND SURROUNDING

The subject property is a two storey semi detached building with rear extension, rear dormer, and front outrigger, in use as a dwellinghouse. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character.

The site is not located in a conservation area nor is it a listed building.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

It is proposed to undertake a rear dormer extension, roof extension, and front first floor extension.

The rear dormer will measure 10.0m in length and 2.3m in height, with a depth of 2.9m. The size of the dormer requires the extension of the roof, increasing its ridge length from approximately 2.5m to 10.0m. Hipped ends will be retained, of approximately 1.6m in depth and height. There is an existing recessed first floor area above the existing garage of approximately 2.4m in depth, and this is proposed to be filled to be flush with the garage level below with a new front window proposed.

Two front rooflights are also proposed.

3. SITE HISTORY

HGY/2012/2154

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension and erection of side dormer window,

Decision Date: 8 January 2013

Decision: Permitted Development

HGY/2015/2163

Proposal: Erection of new ground floor extension to rear and internal modifications. Replacement of dormer to front elevation with two new separate dormers,

Decision Date: 18 September 2015

Decision: Approve with Conditions

OLD/1979/1153

Proposal: 8/5/79 Erection of s/s rear extension.,

Decision Date: 13 June 1979

Decision: Approve with Conditions

4. CONSULTATION

Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association: no response received.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by the way of letters and a site notice. The following representations have been received:

Objections: 3 (one address)

Material Planning Objections Raised:

- Increase in bulk and scale of the roof form, no longer subordinate to the host building.
- Drawings do not show existing first floor flat roof extension over garage. [Officer comment: this has been amended].
- Imbalances the pair of buildings
- Impacts on daylight/ sunlight by reduction in light to rear first floor bedroom, garden; loss of light via existing rooflights to living room;
- Impacts on amenity by being a dominant extension, overbearing.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and appearance

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.

The proposal seeks to extend the existing first floor and roof structure to facilitate the creation of a loft conversion, including the construction of a rear dormer extension. Associated external alterations include the insertion of a new window within the front elevation above the existing garage and the installation of two rooflights within the front roofslope.

In assessing the proposal, regard has been had to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the wider streetscene. The proposed development will inevitably result in an increase in the overall scale and massing of the dwelling, particularly through the extension of the roof form and the introduction of accommodation at loft level. However, the amended design has sought to minimise the visual impact of these additions.

The scheme has been revised to incorporate a hipped roof design at the side elevation in place of a more prominent gable form. This amendment reduces the perceived bulk of the roof extension when viewed from the public realm and allows the development to integrate more successfully with the prevailing character of the area. The hipped roof form maintains a subordinate appearance relative to the existing dwelling and assists in ensuring that the enlarged roofscape does not appear unduly dominant or incongruous within the street scene, and where matching materials will be utilised.

The proposal must also be considered in the context of the surrounding built environment. Ringwood Avenue exhibits a varied roofscape, with a range of dwelling alterations and extensions evident throughout the street. It is noted that planning permission was granted for a comparable roof extension at No. 32 Ringwood Avenue under reference HGY/2016/0062, while No. 24 Ringwood Avenue displays a similar roof form (HGY/2021/0941). These examples demonstrate that roof enlargements of this nature are an established feature within the locality and contribute to the evolving character of the area.

The proposed front-facing window and rooflights are modest additions that will be proportionate to the host dwelling. The window is appropriately positioned above the existing garage and reflects the scale and rhythm of fenestration evident within the property. The rooflights would sit flush within the roof plane and would be read as minor alterations that would not detract from the appearance of the building or wider streetscape.

At the rear, the proposed dormer extension has also been amended following the submission of the application, with a reduction in its overall length. This alteration has improved the relationship of the dormer with the existing roof form and reduced its visual prominence. Furthermore, substantial rear dormer extensions are a common and characteristic feature of residential properties within the surrounding area. Given their location to the rear, visibility from the public realm would be limited, and the dormer would not have a material impact on the character or appearance of the streetscene.

Overall, whilst the proposal would introduce additional built form at roof level, the design amendments secured during the application process have ensured that the resulting development would remain sympathetic to the host property and its surroundings. The proposal responds appropriately to the established pattern of development in the area, would not appear unduly bulky or visually intrusive, and would preserve the character and appearance of the street scene. The site is not located within a Conservation Area and no designated heritage assets would be affected by the development. Accordingly, the proposal is considered acceptable in design terms and is compliant with the relevant design and placemaking objectives of the development plan.

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. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

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 residents.

In assessing the proposal, consideration has been given to the potential impacts upon the amenities of neighbouring occupiers, having particular regard to outlook, sense of enclosure, daylight, sunlight, privacy and overall living conditions.

No side facing windows are proposed. The proposed rear dormer would incorporate windows serving habitable accommodation at loft level. However, these windows would primarily afford views towards the rear garden of the application property, consistent with the existing pattern of overlooking that exists between neighbouring residential properties. Given the separation distances involved and the typical suburban context, no unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy would arise as a result of the development. The proposed front-facing window and rooflights would similarly not give rise to any material overlooking concerns.

With regard to the property at no. 21 Ringwood Avenue, the site is located to the south of the subject site, with first floor windows facing the subject site. It is understood that the principal living room is located on the ground floor. While the proposal will increase the bulk and massing on the boundary relative to the site at no. 21, considering the existing massing and constrained outlook, the proposal will not result in material impacts on neighbour amenity.

With regard to no. 25 Ringwood Ave located to the north of the subject site, there is one side facing window at the first floor, as well as a rooflight atop the ground floor extension. The window is understood to serve a bedroom, while the rooflight serves the principal ground floor living area. The rooflight serves as a secondary source of natural light to the space, and impacts from reduction in daylight/ sunlight from the proposal will not be material. Similarly, while the side-facing bedroom window may experience some alteration to its outlook, the window serves a habitable room of a secondary nature and already has an outlook influenced by neighbouring development typical of the suburban context. Impacts on daylight, sunlight and sense of enclosure and outlook from the dwelling will be non-material in the context of the built up suburban pattern of development.

The first-floor terrace/balcony area within No. 25, which extends along part of the side of the property adjacent to the application site, is noted. The increased height and massing of the proposal would inevitably alter the experience of users of this external amenity space and would increase the extent of built form visible from the terrace. Nevertheless, the terrace lies to the north of the application property and is already influenced by the existing built form on the application site. Furthermore, the terrace extends significantly beyond the side elevation and continues towards the rear of the neighbouring property, with substantial areas remaining unaffected by the proposed development. Whilst some increase in enclosure would therefore occur adjacent to the shared boundary, the impact would not be so severe as to render the space unacceptably enclosed or significantly diminish its utility and enjoyment.

Having considered the relationship between the proposal and neighbouring properties, it is concluded that the development would not result in unacceptable harm to residential amenity in terms of outlook, sense of enclosure, daylight, sunlight or privacy. Whilst some changes would be experienced by occupiers of adjoining properties as a consequence of the proposed development, these impacts would be limited in extent and would not exceed those reasonably associated with residential development within this established suburban setting that would warrant refusal. Accordingly, the proposal is considered to provide an acceptable relationship with neighbouring occupiers and would comply with the relevant residential amenity objectives of the development plan.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered acceptable subject to conditions. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

7. CIL APPLICABLE

The proposed extensions do not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. BNG

N/A

9. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions.

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 as listed below except where conditions attached to this planning permission indicate otherwise or where alternative details have been subsequently approved following an application for a non-material amendment.

Approved plans list:

RNW-PL-GA-01; RNW-PL-GA-02C; RNW-PL-GA-03C; RNW-PL-GA-04C; RNW-PL-GA-05C; Location Plan.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

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.