

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4466
Type	Householder planning permission
Location	86 Grosvenor Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2DS
Proposal	Conversion of loft comprising a hip-to-gable side extension. rear dormer extension and the installation of rooflights to the front roof slope.
Case Officer	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date	19/12/2022
Applicant	Ms. Jessica Olive
Agent	Mr. Jeffrey Atkins

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

This is an application for the formation of a new rear dormer window and installation of front rooflights to an end of terrace dwelling house.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling house situated on the northern side of Grosvenor Road. The site backs onto Muswell Hill Gold Course. The surrounding area is wholly residential in character.

The site is located within Vallance Road conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building. The host property is located along the northern side of Grosvenor Road, where there are section of properties that feature front turret bay projecting elements.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

- None

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 5 letters.

A signed petition from 4 neighbouring properties has been received objecting to the application on the following grounds:

Concerned that the submitted Design and Access Statement states that the external materials will be 'similar' in appearance to the existing, where as the objectors believe that they should be an exact match. Concerns also raised about the position of the flank wall in relation to the adjoining neighbour's dormer.

Officer comment: If minded to recommend approval the officer would suggest a condition requiring details of external materials to be used on the development to be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval, in order to safeguard the character and appearance of the conservation area.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

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

Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

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 Vallance Road Conservation Area is primarily made up of a number of residential streets with Arts and Crafts inspired semi-detached houses built between 1909 and the 1920s. The application site is a 1920s house on the northern side of Grosvenor Road opposite the junction with Grasmere Road. In contrast to the surrounding Arts and Crafts houses on the southern side of Grosvenor Road and in the wider conservation area, the terraced appeal property is neo Georgian in design. The terraced houses at Nos 34 to 90 step in and out in groups of 2 or 3 houses along the street between the junctions of Grosvenor Road with Rhodes Avenue and Grasmere Road, with only one block of later three-storey flats interrupting their uniformity. This cohesion and the way this side of the road is laid out contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

While there have been a number of interventions, such as poor quality upvc windows, unsympathetic front rooflights and the loss of some front gardens and boundary treatment, as a whole the group retains much of its original form and appearance. It appears only two properties have had full hip to gable extensions, nos. 76 and 80 which together bookend a terrace of three properties. these are discussed in more detail below.

The application site has a large polygonal two-storey turret bay projecting towards the street. This is an attractive and prominent feature which is replicated on one house in every group of 3 houses along the terrace, creating a regular pattern. The main roof is currently aligned with the roofline of the projecting turret bay when viewed from the street. The proposed development would alter this by introducing a full gable end.

The full gable extension would change the relationship of the main roof of the house with the chimney and the projecting turret bay as the extension would extend upwards adjacent to the chimney behind the projecting turret bay. It would fill the existing space between the chimney, main

roof and front turret bay when viewed from the street. By filling this gap, not only would the extension alter the house's balance and character, but it would also affect the symmetry of the main roofs of the group of 2 houses at Nos 86 – 88.

Given the prominent position of this group of houses facing the junction of Grasmere Road, this symmetry is an important feature which is characteristic of this part of the conservation area. The extension would be clearly visible from Grosvenor and Grasmere Roads, both of which lie within the conservation area.

The introduction of the gable roof detail would be significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of Nos.86 and 88 from the change in roof profile that is proposed. Retaining the broad symmetry of this pair of dwellings would be more important in terms of the effect on the streetscene.

It is noted that there are other examples of roof extensions along Grosvenor Road, most of which were constructed prior to the area being designated a conservation area in 2008, now a material planning consideration. The interest of conserving the character and appearance of the conservation area carries greater weight than any such previous precedents. Conservation Area status allows stricter control of certain categories of development in the interests of protecting the special architectural and historic interest of an area. The existence of other hip to gable extensions would be insufficient justification to approve such an extension.

Only two properties in this group of houses appear to have had full hip to gable extensions.

The extension at no. 76 was granted permission in 2016, there is no record of the one at no. 80 ever having been granted planning permission and is likely to have taken place before the designation of the conservation area in 2008. In assessing the application at no.76 (Ref: HGY/2016/0288) the officer's delegated report noted that the existing hip to gable extension at no. 80 bookended this terrace of three houses and concluded that introducing a further hip to gable at no. 80 would not one unbalance the terrace.

The few limited examples of hip to gable extensions remain a rarity within this group of properties, with the majority retaining their original roof forms when viewed from the street. Those examples that have taken place are considered to detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area. Since the last one was granted in 2016 two have been refused:

A hip to gable extension was refused at 54 Grosvenor Road HGY/2021/0679, 12/04/2021. For the following reason:

'The excessive size, scale, and detailed design of the proposed hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer roof extension would cumulatively result in dominant, incongruous and discordant additions to the property which would detract from its symmetry with No.56 and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the property and conservation area, contrary to Policies D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policies DM1, DM9, and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017'.

Permission was also refused for the extension of no.60's existing full hip to a half hip (HGY/2017/0579) for the following reason:

'The partial hip to gable element of the extension would detract from the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policies 7.4 'Local Character', 7.6 'Architecture' and 7.8 'Heritage Assets and Archaeology' of the London Plan (2015), CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in

An appeal against this decision was dismissed on 5th July 2017 (APP/Y5420/D/17/3175656) with the Inspector stating in their report:

'I note the range of extensions and alterations to properties in Grosvenor Road and that a number of these developments received permission after the designation of the conservation area in 2008. Although these extensions and alterations have led to some incremental erosion of the appearance of the conservation area in parts, much of its original character remains. Due to its prominence, the proposal would have an erosive and harmful effect on the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of this part of the conservation area. In this regard, the existence of other roof extensions in the locality and the lack of representations do not alter the harm I have identified'.

'The half gable extension would change the relationship of the main roof of the house with the chimney and the projecting turret bay as the extension would Appeal Decision APP/Y5420/D/17/31756562 extend upwards adjacent to the chimney behind the projecting turret bay. It would fill the existing space between the chimney, main roof and front turret bay when viewed from the street. By filling this gap, not only would the extension alter the house's balance and character, but it would also affect the symmetry of the main roofs of the group of 3 houses at Nos 56 – 60. Given the prominent position of this group of houses facing the junction of Thirlmere Road, this symmetry is an important feature which is characteristic of this part of the conservation area. The extension would be clearly visible from Grosvenor and Thirlmere Roads, both of which lie within 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.

The rear dormer would not create any loss of amenity in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight and outlook to the neighbouring properties as it will not project beyond the rear building line or feature any windows to its cheeks.

Given the existing degrees of mutual overlooking from first floor windows and the degree of additional overlooking created by the dormer glazing is not significantly over above what can be seen from existing rear windows.

Conclusion

The proposed hip to gable element of the extension detracts from the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and fails to enhance or preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area in general. As such the development is contrary with Policies DM1, DM9, 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 accords with the relevant policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.

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

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed hip-to-gable roof extension by reason of its size, design, massing and prominent location, would result in a dominant, incongruous and discordant addition to the property which would detract from the uniformity of the terrace and fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the property and conservation area, contrary to Policies D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policies DM1, DM9, and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017'.