

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/3264
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	15 Caxton Road, Wood Green, London, N22 6TB
Proposal:	Formation of dormers to main and outrigger roof slopes, Installation of Velux rooflight to front roof slope
Case Officer:	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date:	06/12/2023
Applicant:	Mr Dave Kingett
Agent:	Mr Andrew Moore

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse on the north side of Caxton Road. The site had permission for sub-division into two flats in the 70's however the site currently appears as one dwellinghouse from the submitted drawings. The site does not fall within a conservation area, nor is it locally listed.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for the formation of dormers to main and outrigger roof slopes, Installation of Velux rooflight to front roof slope

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

OLD/1976/0150 | Conversion into 2 self-contained flats
Approve w/ 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: 1

Objecting: 1

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

One objection was raised which highlighted that the proposal would result in a loss of privacy due to overlooking.

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.

The proposed L-shaped roof extension would be to the rear of the property. It would be 5.14m wide and be 6.18m deep. The overall height of the proposed roof addition would be stepped by virtue of the lower outrigger, where the outrigger extension would be 2.56m, and the dormer would be 2.12m tall. The proposed extension would be lower than the roof ridge by 0.95m.

It would be finished in materials that match those of the existing dwelling. The L-shapes roof extensions would accommodate no.2 of bedrooms within the subject building. It is observed that a neighbouring property, (No. 5 Caxton Road), has a similar roof extensions, however it does not appear to have planning permission.

The scale and massing of the proposed L-shaped dormer roof extension is considered excessive. As such, the proposal is considered disproportionate to the roof slope and insubordinate to the host building. It would be out of character with the design of the host and neighbouring buildings and out of keeping with the existing pattern of development.

The proposal would be visible from Parkland Road, and as such the additional bulk at the rear of the property would appear at odds with the character of the surrounding area and would not follow the pattern of development in the area.

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.

The scale and massing of the proposed L-shaped dormer roof extension are considered excessive and would result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight. The proposal is unacceptable in amenity terms.

The proposed alterations would introduce additional glazing at roof level, however there would be no significant increase in the extent of overlooking over and above the extant situation, and as such any additional overlooking or loss of privacy resulting from the proposed dormer window would be negligible

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. The proposed development also does not accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

The proposal is considered unacceptable in respect of its character, appearance and impact on the site and would result in material harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. 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 proposed L-shaped dormer would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area by reason of poor design as well as its awkward siting and scale, contrary to DPD Policies DM1, DM2, and London Plan Policy HC1.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed L-shaped dormer, by virtue of its scale and massing would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area by reason of poor design as well as its awkward siting and scale, contrary to DPD Policies DM1 and London Plan Policy D3.