

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0131
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	17 Holmesdale Road, Hornsey, London, N6 5TH
Proposal	Loft conversion including the raising of the roof's ridge, the enlargement of the hip and the installation a dormer extension to the rear.
Case Officer	Mercy Oruwari
Valid Date	16/01/2023
Applicant	Mr James Taylor
Agent	mr Rustem Konakli

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposed alteration and extension of the roof by reason of its size, design and prominence in the streetscene, would result in an over dominant, incongruous and discordant addition to this property, detracting from its appearance and harming the streetscene, and failing to protect the character and appearance of the Highgate conservation area contrary to Policy D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This is an application for the existing roof to be converted into a habitable living area by altering the ridge of the roof and formation of a rear dormer.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is an end of terrace two storey property. The host property is distinctive as it is wider than the other houses within this particular set of terraces. It was also originally a shop before it was converted into a house, and it still retains the original shop surround on the ground floor. On the side of the road where No 17 is located there are two sets of terraces. The first set (No 1-17) sits forward of the first two properties of the next set of terraces. As the host property is the last of that set the site stands out as quite a prominent part of the road. The site is located within the Highgate conservation area but does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

- HGY/2019/2489 - Certificate of lawfulness: proposed use - proposal to remove existing uPVC window at rear of property whereby the existing wall underneath the window will be knocked through replaced by a full floor-to-ceiling steel window with double doors. Permitted Development
- HGY/1989/1325 - Formation of roof extension to provide additional bedroom, involving removal of hipped end to roof and replacement by gable end and installation of dormer window to rear elevation and velux windows to front. Refused
- OLD/1985/0657 - Change of use from office license to residential. Granted

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

1) LBH Conservation Officer:

- The information regarding the site as a heritage asset and the potential impact of the scheme is not sufficient.
- The site is considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
- There are concerns regarding the raising of the ridge height.
- There are concerns regarding the proposed street facing roof-lights.
- There may be potential to extend the ridge and alter the angles of the hips but the ridge height should not be raised.
- There are no objections to the principle of a dormer subject to scale, design and materials.
- The scheme as it stands is not supported.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 1x site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 3

Objecting: 3

Supporting: 0

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee
- Highgate Society

The following issues were raised in the representations:

- The description is misleading as it is not just a roof conversion and the raising of the ridge but is also the replacement of the roof with a steeper pitch, the formation of a full width dormer, and works to the front. These works are contrary to the Conservation Area Management Plans (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).

- Drawings are inadequate and do not show various details including any potential impacts for No 19, the true outline of the works to the roof, possible daylight impacts amongst other details. (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).
- Drawings do not accurately show the extent of the work needed to the party wall between No 15 and the host property (Officer Comment: This is not a material planning consideration as this is covered by Building regulations).
- No 15 forms part of a pair. With the realignment of the pitch and the raising of the ridge at No 17 the symmetry of the terrace will be destroyed (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).
- The extent of the potential works including the rebuilding of the roof, the wall, the raising of the roof and the chimney stack would need a party wall agreement and the overall construction will require a structural engineer (Officer Comment: This is not a material planning consideration as this is covered by Building regulations).
- Application incomplete as there is no Heritage or Design & Access Statements (Officer Comment: This is not a material planning consideration as it is not a requirement (but is desirable for clearer clarification of the proposed scheme) for this type of application).
- Drawings are inadequate and wrong (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).
- Impacts of increasing the front roof height will change the look in comparison to the other nearby roofs (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).
- Also, the new hip will be viewable from the street (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).
- The change in the roof profile including the new dormer may have potential impacts on No 19 including daylight for the side passage, second floor dormer window, ground floor side window, the glazing on the side of the ground floor side extension and the patio (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).
- The full height windows of the dormer would lead to potential overlooking issues to the rear garden of No 19 (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).
- With No 19 being set back and No 17 being an end of terrace all works to the roof will be high visible from the public domain and will harm the Heritage asset of the conservation area (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).
- It is not indicated if the front roof windows will be conservation style (Officer Comment: This has been addressed within the report).

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the 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.

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

The proposed alterations to the roof include both the raising and lengthening of the ridge and the enlarging, and steepening of the hipped roof. It also includes the formation of a full height rear dormer with the installation of 2x roof lights in the front roof slope. The proposed works would unbalance the existing proportions of the application property by way of a top-heavy roof, which would appear bulky. The annotated plans state an increase in the ridge of 0.2m although based on measurements of the scaled plans submitted with the application the increase appear to be at least 0.3 metres.

The houses on this part of the road distinctively sit in pairs with each set having stepped up roof levels as the properties ascend up the hill. No 17 is the last house in this row of terraces and sits alone at the highest level. Due to the fact the property sits prominently higher than the others within this terrace, it would be a notable feature of the local roofscape and would be out of character with the more traditional architecture of these houses. Equally, due to the setback of No 19 and 21, the altered side roof slope/hip would be clearly apparent and would detract from the street scene.

It is noted that there are some examples of altered roof forms on this road, however the examples are sparse, and such alterations are not representative of the overall character of the area. An example at No 2 in particular is noted. However, the intervention did not represent such a dramatic change at this site as the scheme at No 17, namely because of its original roof form, its symmetry with the house to which it is attached and the roofscape to this terrace. Although space was limited at No 2, the host property has even less scope for the ability to allow for the conversion of this space without making drastic alterations to the roof.

It is stated in the Conservation comments that 'There may be potential to extend the ridge and alter the angles of the hips to create additional space, but the ridge height should not exceed the existing'. Without the raising of the ridge the roof would not be provide adequate head height as a habitable usable space.

The harm to the heritage asset (conservation area) in this case would not be acceptable. It is acknowledged that the proposal would help to meet other objectives by providing improved living space. However, the amount of extra space to be provided would be small. This limited benefit would not outweigh the harm identified to the conservation 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.

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.

Concerns have been raised in regards to potential daylight impacts for No 19. Roof extensions are a common feature across the borough. As the proposed works would be confined to the roof level, and within the existing footprint of the host building, there would be no detrimental harm to the amenities of the adjacent occupiers. Equally the full height windows would have the same level of impact as any upper floor windows or a Juliet balcony therefore there will be no significant overlooking impacts and/or on the privacy of neighbouring properties.

Other considerations

The submitted plans appear to be inaccurate and contradictory. The proposed elevation images appear to suggest that the height of the roof would be raised by just 0.2 metres but it appears significantly more than this. It's not clear what this would mean for the plane of the front roof slope as no side elevation has been provided. In addition, for this level of work on such a prominent site in a conservation area, more detailed roof plans would be required in order to thoroughly assess the proposal.

In regards to information on the daylight impacts of scheme this can be requested as additional information.

Conclusion

The proposal is not considered acceptable.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. 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 alteration and extension of the roof by reason of its size, design and prominence in the streetscene, would result in an over dominant, incongruous and discordant addition to this property, detracting from its appearance and harming the streetscene, and failing to protect the character and appearance of the Highgate conservation area contrary to Policy D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017.

