



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0393
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	First And Second Floor Flat B, 51 Gladesmore Road, Tottenham, London, N15 6TA
Proposal:	Replacement screen to 1st Floor Terrace
Case Officer:	Emily Whittredge
Valid Date:	26/02/2024
Applicant:	4 Gladeway Estates Ltd
Agent:	Mr Alan Gunne-Jones

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

This is an application for a replacement balustrade screen to the first floor level roof to the rear of the property. The screen would be sited on the roof of the existing single storey rear addition, enclosing an area 2.75m long and 3.3m wide. The screen is proposed to be 1.7m tall and formed of obscured glass.

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to the flat occupying the first and second floor levels of the property, a mid-terrace property on the north side of Gladesmore Road. The application property has been extended to the rear with a single storey extension.

The area is residential with closely spaced terraces resulting in constrained plots with small rear gardens. The properties within the terrace feature two storey closet wings, and few have been extended. The site is not in a conservation area nor does it relate to a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows:

Planning

OLD/1989/0462 21/12/88 - conversion to form 1x1 bed and 1x2 bed flats. - 16/01/1989 Approve with Conditions

Enforcement

ENF/2023/0384
Creation of a roof terrace
In Progress

FCV/2020/00652
Flat conversion
Immune

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of letters to neighbours. No responses were received following consultation on the application.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

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

Background

At some point in recent times, a door opening was created in the rear elevation to allow access to the roof of the single storey extension, and a plastic "picket fence" balustrade installed. These works did not receive formal planning permission, and are currently the subject of an open enforcement investigation (see History above). These features are shown on the submitted plans as "existing", but given their uncertain status, are not recognised as being lawful in planning terms for the purpose of this application.

The original purpose of the works was for a temporary sukkah for the Jewish former occupants; however, the current proposal relates to the use of the roof as a permanent amenity space.

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.

High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

The application seeks to replace the existing plastic balustrade with an obscure glazed privacy screen to the perimeter of the roof, to facilitate use of the roof as an outdoor amenity space. The privacy screen would measure 1.7m tall enclosing an area 2.75m long and 3.3m wide and would abut the boundary with No. 49.

As previously noted, the application site is within an urban area that is finely grained with constrained plots. Many properties are further subdivided or in multiple occupation. Due to the

small garden sizes (5.5m), and two storey closet wings, there are few examples of rear extensions within the terrace. There are no existing examples of roof terraces or balustrades within the immediate area.

The proposed high balustrade screen, facilitating the use of the existing roof as an amenity space, is considered to be out of keeping with the pattern of development in the immediate area. Development of this nature is considered incompatible with the site as it would significantly increase the height of the existing rear addition, resulting in an overly dominant structure to the rear of the property. Rear extensions themselves are uncommon within the terrace, and there are no other examples of structures of the scale proposed. The use of obscured glazing would appear incongruous within the rear elevation. Typically, extensions to closet wings should be no larger than 3m long and 3m tall, in order to maintain subordination to the host building, and in this instance, the increased height of the extension would be disproportionate to the site.

As such, in design terms, the proposal is considered at odds with the above policies.

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 resident.

The proposed privacy screen would serve to formalise and facilitate use of the extension roof as a private amenity space. As previously discussed, the immediate area is characterised by small plot sizes, with properties closely spaced and small gardens. The host terrace has rear gardens measuring 5.5m long, but as the application property has been extended by 2.8m, the proposed roof terrace and privacy screen would be sited 2.7m from the rear boundary. The site backs onto the residential gardens of Lealand Road, whose nearest properties have extensions that are located 6m and 7m from the rear boundary respectively.

While the 1.7m height of the privacy screen would prevent direct overlooking of the adjoining gardens, including of the flat below, the size of the roof terrace could facilitate gatherings that are likely to give rise to noise nuisance through normal use. Noise levels would be exacerbated by the elevated position of the roof, and could cause a sense of being overlooked. Given the small size of gardens in Gladesmore and Lealand Roads, as well as the proximity of the roof terrace to gardens and habitable rooms, such a use in principle would be intrusive to neighbours and cause a material loss of amenity.

Records show No. 49 is licensed for use by 8 occupiers in one self-contained flat and 7 non self-contained flats (House in Multiple Occupation). The proposed privacy screen directly adjoins the communal garden, and would increase the size of the rear extension from 2.6m tall to 4.3m tall, projecting 2.8m beyond the closet wing. The roof structure would unacceptably increase the sense of enclosure to the garden of No. 49 as well as the ground floor flat of No. 51. The structure would cause some loss of sunlight from the east and possibly the west as a result of the obscured glazing.

Conclusion

For the reasons described above, the proposal would be out of keeping with the established pattern of development in this residential area. The proposed privacy screen and amenity use is considered at odds with the relevant amenity policies in terms of overbearing, noise nuisance, and loss of light.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

CIL APPLICABLE

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, by virtue of its scale, bulk, design and location, would lead to a built form of an unsympathetic scale which would be out of character with the surrounding area and would result in a negative and intrusive impact on neighbouring amenities in terms of overbearing, overshadowing and noise nuisance, contrary to Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policies DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).