

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0972
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	22B Talbot Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4QR
Proposal:	Replacement of existing 1no. 3-casement white double glazed uPVC window with 1no. new 3-casement powder-coated double glazed aluminium window, colour Slate Grey RAL 7015 in similar casement arrangement on front elevation. Vertical enlargement of 1no. existing rear dormer window opening and replacement with 1no. 3-casement powder coated aluminium fully glazed Bifold doors with Juliet balcony, colour Slate Grey RAL 7015 with clear glass safety balustrade externally, inc internal alterations to second floor flat to provide second bedroom. (Retrospective)
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	02/04/2026
	6
Applicant:	Ms Sally Carver
Agent:	

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Proposed development

This is an application for a retrospective replacement of existing 1no. 3-casement white double glazed uPVC window with 1no. new 3-casement powder-coated double glazed aluminium window, colour Slate Grey RAL 7015 in similar casement arrangement on front elevation. Vertical enlargement of 1no. existing rear dormer window opening and replacement with 1no. 3-casement powder coated aluminium fully glazed Bifold doors with Juliet balcony, colour Slate Grey RAL 7015 with clear glass safety balustrade externally, inc internal alterations to second floor flat to provide second bedroom.

2. Site and Surroundings

The application site is a second-floor level flat in subdivided mid-terrace residential building on the west side of Talbot Road. The site is located within Highgate conservation area and is not within the curtilage of a listed building.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

OLD/1979/1342

Address: 22, Talbot Road, N6

Proposal: 2/11/78 Conversion of maisonette on 1st and 2nd floors to 2 self-contained flats.

Decision Date: 8 January 1979

Decision: Approve with Conditions

HGY/2003/1393

Address: 22, Talbot Road, London, N6 4QR, London

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear conservatory extension with new stairs into garden.

Decision Date: 14 October 2003

Decision: Approve with Conditions

4. Consultation

Internal & External consultees

LBH Conservation Officer: The replacement front window is not acceptable, it has been replaced without any reference to the host building and the rest of the openings in the house itself and the wider group and accordingly has a poor relationship to the rest of the building, contrasting harshly in its colour and design and disrupts the hierarchy of the elevation as it is an incongruous and conspicuous addition. Consequently, the replacement front dormer window would be considered to cause harm to the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

The front window would need to revert back to the previous existing or be replaced with one which better matches the existing original details or the previous, in terms of design (pane number/arrangement) and materiality including colour.

The Juliette balcony which has been inserted to the rear presents similar concerns. The design of the enlarged opening and balustrade contrasts sharply with the rest of the building and the change in cill level has poorly altered the proportions and relationship to the below storey which now appears severely thin and uncomfortable. There is no in principle objection to enlarging the dormer window at the rear but the proportions introduced by lowering the cill level and creating a Juliette balcony are not acceptable and the window materials and design should look to complement the existing building, rather than contrast with it.

Conservation would object to this application for the above reasons.

Local amenity groups

The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Highgate CA Advisory Committee

The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Impact of uPVC on character of conservation area
- Change to a dark grey window in front dormer without planning permission.
- All windows on the front along the street scene are white.
- Dark grey window should not constitute a precedent for other coloured windows to the front.
- Rear Juliet balcony is not in-keeping with section 12.2.13 of the Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2013 as do not sit comfortably within the roof form and are not characteristic of this building type
- The Juliet balcony is contrary to the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017 Policies DH2 and DH5 in terms of design and neighbours' amenity.

Neighbour consultation

The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 8 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: 1

Supporting: 0

- Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area
- External changes to the front and rear have a negative impact on the site and street scene.
- The dark slate grey colour is out of keeping with the rest of the property's white frame windows.
- Juliet balcony to the rear is on the third floor (loft floor) and is the only type on the street.
- The glass balustrade size dominates the rear of the building and is out of character with rest of building.
- Glass balustrade removes uniformity with the rest of building and takes away the neo-Victorian feeling from the character of the building.
- Loss of privacy or overlooking from Juliet balcony.
- The design of the Juliet balcony would mean that the occupants would now be able to look directly into the balcony of No.22A below.

Officer response: See section below.

5. Planning Assessment

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are design and heritage and impact on neighbouring amenity, which will be addressed collectively.

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.

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

Page 3 of 5

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.

Policy DH2 'Development Proposals in Highgate's Conservation Areas' of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017 states that development proposals, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Highgate's conservation areas, and respect the setting of its listed buildings and other heritage assets. Development should preserve or enhance the open, semi-rural or village character where this is a feature of the area.

Policy DH5 'Roofs and Roofscape' 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.

Front dormer window

As stated by the Conservation Officer the front window would need to revert back to the previous existing or be replaced with one which better matches the existing original crittalls or the previous, in terms of design (pane number/arrangement) and materiality including colour. Therefore, the current windows and Juliet balcony are not considered to be acceptable.

Rear Juliet Balcony

There are examples of rear balconies at first floor level at the neighbouring properties, so the impact of overlooking and loss of privacy would be neutral as there is mutual overlooking from the balconies at the rear into each other's balconies and into the rear garden that belongs to the ground floor flat, so the addition of a loft floor level balcony is not considered have an impact on overlooking into neighbouring balconies and rear gardens as this element of overlooking has already been compromised. However, the design of the balcony that removes a part of the roof eaves would harm the appearance and character of a property that has a positive contribution to the significance to the character and appearance on Conservation Area. It being dark grey in colour removes uniformity from the windows on the building and street scene that is predominantly white in colour, therefore the retrospective change is not considered to be acceptable.

The proposed dark grey aluminium window frame on the front dormer and rear Juliet balcony at loft level are unsatisfactory and incompatible with those employed in surrounding properties and would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM1 and DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed dark grey aluminium window frames and Juliet balcony lie in an area of sensitive and special character worthy of retention within a Conservation Area. The proposed development, if approved, would seriously detract from the important character to the detriment of the vicinity contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and 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.

6. Recommendation

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s)

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed replacement window to the property's front dormer, by reason of its design, proportions, colour and materiality would appear an uncomplimentary feature at odds with character and appearance of the original house, and would appear out of keeping and seriously detract from the special character of the conservation area, contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed replacement and enlargement of the window on the property's rear dormer by reason of its design, proportions, colour and materiality would appear an uncomplimentary feature at odds with character and appearance of the original house, and would appear out of keeping and seriously detract from the special character of the conservation area, contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.