



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1094
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Flat A, 105 Muswell Hill Road, Hornsey, London, N10 3HS
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage, modification to boundary wall and erection of two-storey side extension to ground floor flat
Case Officer:	Adam Silverwood
Valid Date:	21/04/2026
Applicant:	Mr Justin Parsons
Agent:	Stephen Taylor

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Proposed Development

This is an application for the demolition of the existing garage and the construction of a two-storey side extension to the ground floor flat.

2. Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a three-storey semi-detached building located on the western side of Muswell Hill Road. To the north of the site is a small commercial parade, which is a modernist listed commercial terrace with cinema building marking the transition into the commercial frontage/start of Muswell Hill District Centre. The site lies within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

There is no planning history relevant to the consideration of this application

5. Local Representations

The application has been publicised by way of letters sent to neighbouring properties. No representations were received from neighbours, local groups, etc.

LBH Conservation Officers

'The proposed front and side extension would replace what is a quiet addition to the building with a built form which is much more substantial in scale and prominent in design. The two-storey extension would project forward of the main building line and the bay windows and projects out over the side boundary wall. The proposed scale of the extension and its position would make it a dominant addition that would detract from the original building. The angled form and opening features would exacerbate the awkwardness of the addition. Furthermore, the introduction of a roof terrace would be an out of keeping feature on a front elevation in this location.'

Aside from the impact on the host dwelling, this is not the site for a prominent addition to the street scene. The listed building which is the start of the commercial section of the street and its distinctive art deco exterior should remain the most dominant building on the street, the proposed development would be located in a sensitive position, terminating part of the view from the east, marking the transition between the commercial part of the CA to the residential. The development as proposed would make a quiet side elevation more conspicuous, which would erode some of the prominence of the listed building.

Overall, accordingly the proposed extension, due to its scale and position as well as its design would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the identified designated heritage assets. great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and any harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against public (not private) benefits. Accordingly, as the proposals are considered to cause less than harm to the significance of the Conservation Area and to a lesser extent the listed building adjacent, Conservation would not support this application.

Any solid extension would need to be restricted to behind the main building line at the front, not beyond the existing line of the garage (rather than the canopy) and be designed to be subservient to the existing building.'

6. Material Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and heritage;
2. Impact on Neighbourhood Amenity.

Design and heritage

Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) states that 'all new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area', development 'a) must relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole; b) make a positive contribute to a place improving the character and quality of an area; c) confidently address feedback from local consultation; d) demonstrate how the quality of development will be secured when it is built; e) are inclusive and incorporate sustainable design and construction principles'.

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.

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 proposal seeks to demolish the existing side garage and construct a two-storey extension measuring approximately 8.7m in height, 9.2m in depth, and up to 3.4m in width, incorporating a curved, rotunda-style front projection. The extension would project approximately 3.2 metres forward of the principal elevation of the host dwelling.

The forward siting of the extension is a fundamental concern. By projecting significantly beyond the established building line on a prominent corner plot, the development would appear visually dominant and discordant within the street scene. It would disrupt the established spatial hierarchy, drawing undue attention to what is currently a recessive side elevation and competing with the host building rather than appearing subordinate to it.

This harm is amplified by the site's sensitive position within the conservation area, where it forms part of the transition between residential properties and the adjoining commercial terrace to the north. The neighbouring commercial buildings, including the modernist listed building at the corner, are important elements of the character and legibility of this part of the conservation area.

While views are not protected in themselves, the proposed forward projection would partially obstruct and disrupt views towards the corner and frontage of this modernist listed building, particularly when approaching from the south and east.

This would diminish its visual prominence within the streetscape and weaken the clear transition between the residential and commercial components of the conservation area. This reinforces the inappropriateness of the proposed siting in this location.

Furthermore, the scale, bulk, and design of the extension would exacerbate its visual impact. The exaggerated bay projection and rotunda form would appear overly prominent and not reflective of the host dwelling or surrounding context. While bay windows are a feature of the conservation area, their application here is excessive and results in an overbearing and incongruous addition.

The roof form does not reflect the character of the host building, and although the material palette has some regard to context, the overall composition, when combined with the scale and siting, would appear imposing and at odds with the prevailing built form.

As such, the proposed development fails to respect the established building line, the hierarchy of built form, and the character of the conservation area. It would represent an unduly prominent, visually intrusive, and poorly integrated addition within a sensitive heritage context.

The proposal is therefore considered to result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. In line with national policy, this harm must be given great weight and is not outweighed by any identified public benefits.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

London Plan Policy D6 requires development to safeguard the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers, including access to daylight, sunlight, and privacy. Policy DM1 similarly requires a high standard of amenity for neighbouring occupiers.

The proposed first-floor windows facing north-east and south-east would overlook the public realm and are not considered to result in material harm to neighbouring amenity.

The rear-facing windows would be located approximately 55 metres from the nearest residential property and would not give rise to harmful overlooking, loss of privacy, or loss of outlook.

Additional flank windows would face the adjacent commercial area. Given the presence of existing flank windows on this elevation, the proposal is not considered to materially worsen the existing situation.

Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable in respect of neighbouring amenity.

Conclusion

The proposed two-storey side extension, by virtue of its prominent forward siting, excessive scale, and incongruous design, would fail to respect the established building line and spatial hierarchy of the surrounding area. The development would appear visually dominant within the street scene, particularly on this corner plot, and would disrupt the transition between the residential properties and the adjoining commercial terrace.

The proposal would also, in part, obstruct and disrupt views towards the adjoining modernist listed building, diminishing its prominence and contribution to the character of this part of the conservation area. While such views are not protected in their own right, this impact highlights the poor siting and visual intrusion of the development.

Overall, the proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area and the setting of nearby listed buildings. This harm is not outweighed by any public benefits.

The development is therefore considered unacceptable and is contrary to the policies listed above. All other relevant considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.

7. CIL Applicable

N/A – Under 100sqm no new unit.

8. Recommendation

It is therefore recommended that this application be REFUSED for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed extension by reason of its forward siting beyond the established building line, scale, bulk and design, would appear as a dominant and visually intrusive addition, failing to remain subservient to the host dwelling and harming the character and appearance of the street scene, the Conservation Area, and the setting of nearby listed buildings, contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).