

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0550
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	12 Parklands, Cholmeley Park, Hornsey, London, N6 5FE
Proposal:	Loft conversion including extension to hipped roof and erection of rear dormer, installation of flat roof to existing rear dormer, and replacement of front and rear fenestration.
Case Officer:	Mark Chan
Valid Date:	02/03/2026
Applicant:	Merricks
Agent:	Charlton

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a three-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse on the southern side of Parklands and is part of the Parklands development built in the 1990s. The site falls within Highgate Conservation Area (CA) and the host building is considered to have a neutral impact on the significance of the CA. The architectural quality, detailing and existing materials of the building is deemed to be a sympathetic integration within the historic environment of the CA and were designed to not harm to the significance of the CA. The site is also close to the Grade II Listed Cholmeley Lodge, which is an early 20th century building that has been converted into flats.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a loft conversion at the host building which includes extension to the hipped roof and erection of a rear dormer. A flat roof would be installed to the existing rear dormer, and front and rear fenestrations would also be replaced.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

The application history in relation to this site is noted.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal and External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

LBH Conservation Officer: Raised objection with the main concern being the additional bulk caused by the upwards extension at the side and the design of the dormer(s) to the rear.

The additional height at the front, with less enclosure of the chimney would make the roof form much bulkier and make the building appear very top heavy. To the rear the two separate storeys of dormers would be an alien feature with odd proportions and would be a poor-quality addition. Both additions would also further accentuate the buildings verticality, which is one of the weaker aspects of its design and would unbalance this building in the group of four. Overall, the proposed development would create a very incongruous and dominant roof form which would not be considered acceptable.

Relating to the replacement windows, it is not an in-principle objection to the replacement of the windows, nor to changing the design of some of them, however No. 12 is part of a semi-detached pair, and part of a 4-unit group and these need to be considered together. The first floor windows are a consistent size and design and the changes proposed, form a 6 pane to a 4 pane window would make the building much more incongruous. The other window arrangement proposed also appear over-sized, particularly compared to No. 11 and these two building need to be considered together. It would help the design if the existing windows at No 11 were drawn accurately, otherwise the impact of the changes could not be fully assessed.

It should be noted that the windows installed at 21, the ones referenced in the D&A, do not appear to have been built in accordance with the approved plans. However, these had much smaller panes of glass than those existing at No. 12 and it was designed as a stand-alone building.

Local amenity groups

The following local groups/societies made representations:

Highgate CAAC objected to the application for the 3 main reasons:

1. Rear dormers – The proposed flat roof dormers conflict with the Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan (2013), specifically the guidelines on "Roof Forms and Extensions". The larger dormer is not subordinate in scale, does not sit comfortably within the existing roof form, and fails to be set in 1m from the ridge and sides. The design would destroy the visual consistency shared with neighbouring houses and set a bad precedent for future incongruous changes. The proposals are also inconsistent with the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) and the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).
2. Windows – New windows must visually match those of neighbouring houses to maintain the homogeneity and character of the Parklands development. The application does not provide enough detail to determine if the replacement windows will successfully match the originals. More detail and larger scale are needed to comply with conservation requirements regarding doors and windows.
3. Inappropriate precedents – The precedents cited in the application's Design and Access Statement (DAS) are considered irrelevant. The referenced property at 15 Parklands is a much larger, one-off house, and its dormer was only approved after revisions made it substantially smaller and compliant with policy. Comparisons to 18, 19, and 20 Parklands are invalid because the wider dormers on those properties are original features and are much smaller relative to the scale of their roofs. Examples of dormers on completely different houses across Highgate, many built before the conservation area or current policies existed, are also irrelevant to this application.

Neighbour Consultation

The application was advertised by way of a notice placed in the local press, a notice placed outside the premises, and letters sent to neighbouring properties. The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

A total of 3 responses were received from neighbours and 1 objection was received.

The following issues were raised in representations and are addressed further on in this report or below:

- Failure to meet setback requirements: The proposed dormer spans the entire width of the roof slope, completely ignoring the requirement for a minimum 1m setback from the edge of the gable.
- Lack of subordination: Because it lacks the required setbacks, the dormer's excessive massing creates a top-heavy design that dominates, rather than remains subordinate to, the original roof and the adjoining property.
- Disruption of character and symmetry: The disproportionate scale and "wall of glass" aesthetic disrupt the architectural balance of the semi-detached pair, creating an overbearing feature that harms the character of the Highgate Conservation Area.
- Loss of privacy: The combination of a low cill height (60cm) and a tall vertical window (1.7m) acts as a "lookout," facilitating an intrusive downward line of sight into neighbouring private amenity spaces.

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.

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.

Policy DH5 'Roof and Roofscape' of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) states that roof extensions, dormers and rooflights should respect the existing roof form in terms of design, scale, materials and detail and be restricted to the rear except where they are part of the established local character and a new extension or dormer would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the

area or the significance of heritage assets; re-roofing materials should avoid use of inappropriate substitute materials that can erode the character and appearance of buildings and areas.

The proposed loft conversion includes an increase in the expanse of the existing hipped roof at the ridge level of the main roof, and erection of a new rear dormer. The western corner of the existing hipped roof would be raised to match the existing ridge to form a nearly gabled end roof. The new rear dormer would be full width at 4.7m wide and 1.7m high with lead cladding and painted timber framed casement windows. Other minor alterations include the installation of a flat roof to the existing small rear dormer, and replacement of front and rear fenestration.

As noted by the Council's Conservation Officer, the additional height and massing of the main roof, with less enclosure of the chimney would make roof form much bulkier and make the host building appear very top heavy. The new rear dormer, given its width and height, is also not subordinate to the rear roof slope and does not sit comfortably within the existing roof form as it is not well set in from the ridge and edges of the main roof. Lastly, the host building should be viewed as a pair of semi-detached properties with No. 11 and the proposed roof extension and addition of a large rear dormer would upset the symmetry of this pair and create an architecturally unbalanced and visually dominant building that would harm the character and appearance of the locality and the street scene, and the historic significance of the Highgate CA. The design would detract from the visual consistency shared with neighbouring houses.

To the rear, the two separate storeys of dormers would be an alien feature with odd proportions. Both rear dormers would also further accentuate the buildings verticality and would further unbalance the architecture, scale and massing of the semi-detached pair which the host building forms part of, as well as within the group of four semi-detached properties on this side of the road.

Whilst the host building is considered to have a neutral impact on the significance of the Highgate CA, the architectural quality, detailing and existing materials of the building is deemed to be a sympathetic integration within the historic environment of the CA and were originally designed to not harm to the significance of the CA.

In terms of replacing the front and rear fenestration, there is not an in-principle objection to replacements as stated by the Council's Conservation Officer. However, as the host building is part of a semi-detached pair, and part of a 4-unit group, the architectural composition of the group need to be considered together. The front windows would be the same size, but their design would be changed from a 6 pane to a 4 pane division. This would adversely affect the appearance of the building and the wider group. Like the front windows, the design of the rear windows would be changed but given their rear location, the impact on the character and appearance of the host building and wider CA would be more limited.

Overall, the proposal would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider 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.

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.

It is not considered the proposed roof extension, erection of the rear dormer nor the replacement of existing fenestrations in the host building would result in a material loss of sunlight/daylight or increase the sense of enclosure to the neighbouring properties. The fenestration on the new rear dormer would not introduce any new significant overlooking over and above the current situation.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed loft conversion including the roof extension and rear dormer and fenestration alterations would adversely impact the character and appearance of the host building and the wider conservation area, and would visually unbalance the architectural consistency of the pair of semi-detached properties that the host building forms a part of, resulting in less than substantial harm to the historic significance of the Highgate CA.

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

Refuse permission for the following reason:

The proposed loft conversion including the roof extension and rear dormer and fenestration alterations, would adversely impact the character and appearance of the host building and the wider conservation area, and would visually unbalance the architectural consistency of the pair of semi-detached properties that the host building forms a part of, contrary to policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Strategic Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DH5 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017 and policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed loft conversion including the roof extension and rear dormer and fenestration alterations, would adversely impact the character and appearance of the host building and the wider conservation area, and would visually unbalance the architectural consistency of the pair of semi-detached properties that the host building forms a part of, contrary to policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Strategic Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DH5 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017 and policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.