

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1214
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	22 Bryanstone Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8TN
Proposal:	Erection of an L-shape roof extension to a terraced house
Case Officer:	Josh Parker
Valid Date:	15/05/2026
	6
Applicant:	Luis Xanthos Michael
Agent:	Steven Davidson

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SITE AND SURROUNDING

The subject site comprises a two-storey mid-terraced Victorian style dwelling with a distinctive rectangular bay windows.

The proposal is located Southern side of Bryanstone Road and is located within the Crouch End Conservation Area however is not within the curtilage of a listed building.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The applicant is proposing the following works to the dwelling:
The erection of a L-shape dormer to a terrace house

SITE HISTORY AND ENFORCEMENT

All planning and enforcement applications have been considered for this application.

HGY/2019/1940 - Full planning permission
Replacement of existing loft dormer
APPROVED

HGY/2024/3498 - Householder planning permission
The erection of a L-shape dormer to a terrace house
REFUSED on the following grounds:

The proposed extension by virtue of its siting and scale would be dominant and would negatively complicate the roofspace; removing the chimney and altering the outrigger roofslope, disrupting the architectural composition to this house and the pattern of development of the area, overall harming the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area.

CONSULTATION

LBH conservation:

- The subject site contributes positively to the Conservation Area.
- The outriggers of the houses along Bryanstone Road all remain appreciable and unaltered at first floor and above.
- The change in height would cause it to have an unusual vertical emphasis.
- The proposals would also involve the loss of the chimney, and would dominate the roofslope and erode any appreciation of the form of the building and its outrigger.
- The proposed dormer would be an incongruous and dominant addition which would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Crouch End Conservation Area
- The HGY/2016/1222 application is noted however this was only granted on the basis the outrigger extension was existing dating from the mid-late C20 which is clearly not the case at this site. It is noted that what is on site at 3 Russell Road does not appear to match the plans approved under the HGY/2016/1222 application, and paragraph 209 of the NPPF should be considered.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

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

Objections:0

Support:0

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and heritage;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity;

Design and heritage:

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. DPD Policy D9 requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas.

Crouch End is an excellent example of a late-Victorian/early Edwardian suburban development created from the last quarter of the 19th century until the start of the First World War. The area was built up in phases as land became available for development, but it nevertheless has a cohesive character. There is a generally high standard of materials and construction and a consistent architectural approach, influenced in part by the residential work of Norman Shaw. The pre-1914 development resulted in the creation of a new middle-class suburban community complete with shops, places of worship and entertainment. The houses reflected the eclectic design approach of the time, borrowing from different traditions and fully exploiting the early use of prefabricated or machine-made components such as windows, porches and other architectural details.

Nos. 1-19 and 2-28 are identical terraces in stock brick with stone dressings, shallow full-height bay windows with a hipped roof, and paired porches with a moulded cornice. The terraces are well preserved, and it is, including No. 22, considered to positively contribute to the significance of the Crouch End Conservation Area as a good example of late C19 architecture.

This application follows the previously refused HGY/2024/3498 application. The main difference is changing the slanted rooflight element into a solid eave junction which has made the proposed dormer somewhat bulkier than the previous design.

The outriggers of the houses along Bryanstone Road all remain appreciable and unaltered at first floor and above, set down from the existing eaves. These remain the dominant features of the rear elevation of the buildings and are an important part of the terraces original form. The dormer as existing is probably the largest it could be, occupying the whole rear roof slope.

The proposed dormer is L-shaped and would project outwards onto the lower outrigger roof. The change in height would cause it to have an unusual vertical emphasis. The proposals would also involve the loss of the chimney, and would dominate the roofslope and erode any appreciation of the form of the building and its outrigger. Its materiality and design would make it an incongruous addition.

The 2019 approved permission for the site (ref. HGY/2019/1940) proposed a modestly enlarged dormer confined entirely to the primary rear roof slope, avoiding any alteration to the outrigger. That approval represents the maximum dormer size considered appropriate within the identical terrace groups at Nos. 1–19 and 2–28, where roof forms are consistent and additions are expected to remain clearly subordinate. The approved 2019 configuration therefore provides a relevant benchmark for assessing the current proposal and reinforces the expectation that dormers should be limited to the primary rear roof slope, similar to that of all other modest dormer precedents in the quadrant (Bryanstone, Berkeley, Shanklin and Crouch Hall Road).

An application (HGY/2016/1222) for works at works at 3 Russell Road has again been referenced; however, that permission was granted on the basis that an existing dormer and outrigger extension were already present on the site, despite having been constructed without the benefit of planning permission. The precise timeline of these works at 3 Russell Road is uncertain, though satellite imagery indicates that the structure may have been in situ as early as 1999. Given its unauthorised origin and long-standing presence, it should be discounted as a precedent for assessing the current proposal. It should be noted that what is on site at 3 Russell Road does not appear to match the plans approved under the HGY/2016/1222 application, and paragraph 209 of the NPPF should be considered (Planning authorities must evaluate the asset as if it were not damaged).

Notwithstanding the above, the 2016 development (HGY/2016/1222) has little spatial relationship to the subject site, equally does not set a precedent that justifies further harmful additions. The planning system does not operate on the basis that one unsympathetic form of development can justify another. Rather, each proposal must be assessed on its own merits against the prevailing character of the area. In this case, the cumulative effect of adding further bulk would serve to exacerbate harm and would further clutter and erode the coherence of the roofscape.

The proposed dormer would be an incongruous and dominant addition which would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Crouch End Conservation Area. As the Crouch End Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the heritage asset's conservation. The proposed works would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the significance of the Conservation Area, in the words of the NPPF, and do not consider there to be any public benefits of the proposal which would outweigh this harm and therefore warrants refusal on the harm to the conservation area alone.

The dormer and outrigger addition are contrary to S72 of the P(LBCA)A Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and NPPF (2024) paragraphs 202, 207, 209, 212 and 215.

Amenity Comments

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 proposal effectively replaces the bulk of the existing outrigger, and it is this mass that forms the basis of the amenity assessment. Given its height and scale, the enlarged form would have some impact on the outlook and daylight experienced by the adjoining dormer windows at No. 24. While this relationship is not ideal, the degree of change would not, in isolation, warrant refusal, as the effects remain within the range typically experienced in a tight terraced context.

The orientation of the outrigger windows results in direct views toward No. 20, creating an awkward relationship with the neighbouring dormer in terms of privacy. However, the submitted floor plan indicates that this part of the accommodation would function as a WC, and it is therefore reasonable to anticipate the use of obscured glazing on this elevation.

To ensure an acceptable arrangement, a condition could be imposed requiring all windows below 1.7m facing No. 20 to be obscure-glazed and non-opening (unless the opening part is above 1.7m). Securing this through condition would adequately mitigate potential overlooking and render the relationship acceptable.

Subject to securing a condition to obscure the side windows as previously mentioned, the proposal would meet all amenity tests when considering effects on light, bulk, sense of enclosure and privacy for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

The proposed extension by virtue of its siting and scale would be dominant and would negatively complicate the roofspace; removing the chimney and altering the outrigger roofslope, disrupting the architectural composition to this house and the pattern of development of the area, overall harming the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area.

The proposed works are contrary to S72 of the P(LBCA)A Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and NPPF (2024) paragraphs 202, 207, 209, 212 and 215.

CIL

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.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed extension by virtue of its siting and scale would be dominant and would negatively complicate the roofspace; removing the chimney and altering the outrigger roofslope, disrupting the architectural composition to this house and the pattern of development of the area, overall harming the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area.

The proposed works are contrary to S72 of the P(LBCA)A Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and NPPF (2024) paragraphs 202, 207, 209, 212 and 215.