

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0124
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	31 Hewitt Road, Hornsey, London, N8 0BS
Proposal:	Erection of a ground floor rear roof extension, raised ridge roof extension complete with L-shaped dormer, roof terrace and 1.8m high brick privacy screen, internal alterations and all associated works.
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	16/01/2024
Applicant:	4
Agent:	Mr Ajanthan Arul Mrs Volha Darashkevich Mr Joshua Eves

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two storey terraced dwellinghouse on the north side of Hewitt Road. The site does not fall within a conservation area.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for the erection of a ground floor rear roof extension, raised ridge roof extension complete with L-shaped dormer, roof terrace and 1.8m high brick privacy screen, internal alterations and all associated works.

The proposal is similar to the planning permission under HGY/2023/2555. The difference is the L-shaped part of the dormer is proposed to be extended by an extra 1.19m, which would push the roof terrace closer to the rear of the outrigger. The existing brick parapet on the boundary is proposed to be raised to create a brick privacy screen which would slope down to 1.8m minimum.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/2023/2555 – Erection of a ground floor rear roof extension, raised ridge roof extension complete with L-shaped dormer, roof terrace, internal alterations and all associated works. (AMENDED DESCRIPTION). Granted permission 20/11/2023.

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 **0**

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.

Roof extension

The proposed roof extension would be to the rear of the property. It would be 5.18m wide and be 2.90m deep above the main roof, and 3.34m wide and 4.49m deep above the outrigger. The roof ridge would be raised by 0.4m in height, but would be pushed back from the existing line, and so the gradient of the existing slope would remain unchanged.

It would be finished in materials that match those of the existing dwelling. The roof extension would accommodate 1no. bedroom, 1no. shower room, and 1no. office within the subject building. It is observed that neighbouring properties have similar roof extensions.

In comparison to the previous approval, the massing in the proposed roof extension is considered excessive. Revisions to set back overall proposal by 2m from the edge of the outrigger were advised but the applicant did not to accept this proposed amendment. 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.

Roof terrace

The proposed roof terrace would be to the rear of the existing roof. It would be 3.34m wide and be 2m deep. The proposed roof terrace would be at second level, lower than the roof ridge by 3m, and would be setback from the sides of the existing roof by 1.4m from the rear and 0.26m from the sides, and lower than the ridge of the main roof.

It would have a minimum 1.8m high brick privacy screen adjacent to No.29 and the decking finished in materials that match those of the existing dwelling.

The siting and design of the proposed roof terrace is considered excessive in scale and not carefully designed in relation to the appearance of the roof and building and would be openly visible. It would not preserve the existing roof form and not complement the elevation on which the proposed roof terrace is located.

The bulk of the screening material adjacent to No.29 in the proposed roof terrace is considered as a prominent bulky and incongruous addition, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host

building and the street scene. As such, the proposal is considered insubordinate to the roof slope and out of keeping with the existing pattern of development. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding 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.

Roof extension

The scale and massing of the proposed roof extension are considered excessive and would not result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight, or have an overbearing appearance to Nos.29 and 33. The proposal is unacceptable in amenity terms.

Roof terrace

The fact that the terrace is visible from neighbouring windows is no different to surrounding gardens and once fully fenced, the Council is satisfied that there would be no substantive effect on outlook. Considering the depth of the proposal, revisions were proposed by the Council to add a 1.7m high privacy screen on the side facing No.33 but the applicant refused to accept these amendments. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed terrace in its current state would cause harm to the amenity of No.33.

The scale and massing of the proposed roof terrace are considered excessive and would result in a loss of privacy. The proposal is unacceptable in amenity terms.

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 SP12 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 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 application is recommended for refusal for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed roof extension would be, by reason of bulk, unacceptably harmful in terms of the appearance of the site and rear street scene contrary to DPD Policies DM1 and DM12, and London Plan Policy D6.

The proposed roof terrace would be, by reason of design and siting, unacceptably harmful in terms of the character and appearance of the site and street scene, and cause unacceptable overlooking of No.33 leading to a loss of privacy, contrary to DPD Policies DM1 and DM12, and London Plan Policy D6.