

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0983
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Flat B, 54 Woodstock Road, Hornsey, London, N4 3EX
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey extension with roof terrace in place of a flat roof at the rear of the property and replacement of existing single glazed sash windows with double glazed timber sash windows.
Case Officer:	Josh Parker
Valid Date:	09/04/2024
Applicant:	Raquel Gomez Conde
Agent:	Elena Comai

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

SITE AND SURROUNDING

The application site comprises of a four-storey end of terrace house with a generous lower ground floor in use as 3 flats. The application pertains to the upper floors being flat B.

The site is located on the western side of Woodstock Road, within Stroud Green Conservation Area. Lancaster Road comprises of four storey dwellings in somewhat uniform terraces, similar scales and styles of houses. The application site is considered to make a positive contributor to the conservation area (CA).

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The applicant is proposing the following works to the dwelling:

Erection of a single storey extension and roof terrace in place of a flat roof at the rear of the property and replacement of existing single glazed sash windows with double glazed timber sash windows.

SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT

All existing planning applications have been considered for this application.

ENF/2023/0230 – Unauthorised works to the rear of the building. Replacing a window with a door creating a potential roof terrace on a flat roof. Closed

CONSULTATION

LBH conservation: The large terrace accessed by the living room should be omitted otherwise generally acceptable.

LBH enforcement: Permissions would address the works to the rear.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by the way of site/press notice and letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

Objections:1

Support:0

Objections summarised:

Amenity

- Overlooking from terraces
- Consistent with refusal HGY/2010/0068 for the installation of a flat balcony.
- Noise generated from the balcony/terrace would disturb neighbours.

Design

- Uniformity to the rear would be lost.
- As the rear is visible it would have a negative impact on the CA.
- Consistent with refusal HGY/2023/3173.
- Black balustrade at odds with CA.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance of Stroud Green conservation area;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity;

Design and appearance of Conservation Area:

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. DPD Policy D9 requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas.

The applicant seeks to create a single storey rear extension on the third floor to extend above the existing rear extensions. The addition would have a flat roof and facilitate an additional bedroom space. On the southern side shared with No. 52 a proposed balcony accessed from the staircase would be created by extending existing flat roof and accessed by a set of French doors and black metal balustrade and bricks to match.

The objection made suggests that the uniformity to the rear is rhythmic and a point in the terrace (Nos. 2 - 56) where there the original form is intact and retained and any interference with this would result in harm to the conservation area. This line would appear to be the top two storeys and, in some cases, however the top story is relatively untouched and does offer a glimpse into the period's architectural style and contributing to the area's historic character. It should be stated that there are differing rear modifications regarding height and bulk and the proposed additions are generally modest and would not appear incongruous within the terrace.

Since the original submission there has been the omission of the top terrace/balustrade and the original window reinstated to address to retain the above observations and follow the LBH

conservations officers recommendation. The rear modifications have modest footprints and differing height changes which break up the bulk to rear. The extension follows similar footprints of other extensions on the terrace adding to the existing to make works appear subordinate to the host building. The objection references a couple cases which were refused however Ref: HGY/2023/3173 pertains to a roof terrace and is at odds with the scope of this permission and needs no further commentary.

Officers accept that the works to the rear would be visible however would be confined to Ennis Road which is a substantial distance away from the works with numerous visual barriers with several mature trees restricting views and therefore works would have a minimal impact on the street scene contrary to the objection.

It is important for properties to benefit from their own individual amenity/outdoor space and small amenity space accessed from the primary stair access enhances the quality of accommodation which holds little weight in the decision making however, has been noted by officers.

Noting the enforcement case referenced above the door would appear to be somewhat retrospective however the materials including the French door, black metal balustrade and brick to match would be acceptable for this development.

The works would not be largely visible from public advantage points, would be subordinate to the host building and sympathetic on the conservation area and therefore is considered to be of acceptable design, form and appearance for this site.

Amenity Comments

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 scale, massing and sting of the rear extension would not have a material impact upon the amenity of neighbouring properties at No. 56 who would share the northern firewall with the subject site. Although the added height from the single storey rear extension would have a modest impact on the third storey widow to the north, it would appear that the 45-degree BRE angle would be met and therefore would not cause material harm on the impact of lighting on No. 56. The additional height to the south by lifting the flat roof to construct the roof terrace is minimal and would not cause any material harm on No. 52

With the absence of the large roof terrace there would be minimal overlooking from as the only terrace is now on the southern side and is a small platform that would offer a degree of overlooking to all adjoining properties however only modestly more than the likes of a Juliette balcony due to the small nature of the terrace. The objection of the terrace was noted before the omission of the large terrace so in light of the revised plans, the small terrace on the southern can only be assessed. This addition as mentioned above is small in nature and would be able to host a couple of people at once. It is noted that the proposed roof terrace may provide the opportunity for gatherings. Given its modest size, there would be less likelihood of noise reaching intrusive levels

form conservation however this is often likened to conversations carrying from a rear garden and would not warrant a refusal.

All works proposed meet all amenity tests when considering effects on light, bulk, sense of enclosure and privacy for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

Subject to conditions the proposal is considered acceptable and would not cause undue harm on the conservation area. 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.

CIL

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.

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 listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

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

- 3 The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

Informatives:

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.

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.