



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0554
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	61 Cholmeley Crescent, Hornsey, London, N6 5EX
Proposal:	Formation of front dormer and extension of side and rear dormers.
Case Officer:	Adam Silverwood
Valid Date:	17/03/2026
Applicant:	Mr Charles Blundell
Agent:	Mr Eric Mouzourides

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This is an application for the construction of a front dormer and the expansion of the existing side and rear dormers.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located on the northern side of Cholmeley Crescent, a horseshoe-shaped residential crescent situated to the north-east of Highgate High Street. The crescent is characterised by predominantly 1930s semi-detached dwellings, many of which, including the application property, are situated significantly above street level with elevated rear gardens rising away from the highway.

The houses along Cholmeley Crescent display a variety of architectural detailing including half-timbering, tiled hanging, red brickwork, pebbledash finishes, casement windows and leaded lights. The majority of properties retain their original architectural features, which collectively contribute to the special architectural and historic interest of the area.

The application site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/1993/0833 – Erection of single storey rear extension and erection of dormer windows to side and rear to facilitate loft conversion. Refused: 29/12/1993.

HGY/1993/0101 – Erection of ground floor rear extension. Approved with Conditions: 15/03/1994.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of letters sent to neighbouring properties, a site notice placed within the vicinity of the site and advertisement in a local newspaper. Two comments have been received from local residents. These comments raise the following concerns:

- The proposal would be disproportionate in scale to the host property and neighbouring dwellings.
- The Juliette balcony would result in unacceptable overlooking of neighbouring rear gardens.
- Existing dormers may not benefit from planning permission.
- The proposal represents overdevelopment of the site.
- The development would not be in keeping with the design of the host building or the character of the area.
- The proposal is not accurately represented within the submitted plans.

An objection has been received from the Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee on the following grounds:

- The proposal conflicts with current and emerging Local Plan policies which generally restrict dormers to rear roof slopes and discourage front dormers.
- Front dormers are not characteristic of Cholmeley Crescent and would harm the character of the street and the Highgate Conservation Area.
- The applicant's cited precedent at No. 63 Cholmeley Crescent is not relevant as it predates current policy and was never implemented.
- A similar dormer proposal at the property was refused in 1993 due to concerns regarding its scale and impact on the Conservation Area.
- The enlargement of the side dormer to create a wrap-around roof extension would repeat concerns identified in the previous refusal.

LBH Conservation Officer raises an objection to the proposal on heritage grounds, concluding that the development would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations are:

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

Design and Heritage

Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) requires development to achieve a high standard of design and contribute positively to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. Development should relate positively to neighbouring buildings, reinforce local character and preserve the quality of the surrounding townscape. 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 affecting designated and non-designated heritage assets to be assessed against the significance of the asset and the impact of the proposal upon that significance. Alterations and extensions should be of a high-quality, site-specific and sensitive design that respects the form, scale, architectural character and detailing of the host building, including important features such as chimneys and roof forms.

Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan requires development proposals to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Highgate's conservation areas. Policy DH5 states that roof extensions, dormers and rooflights should respect the existing roof form in terms of design, scale, materials and detailing and should generally be restricted to rear roof slopes unless they form part of the established character of the area and would not adversely affect the significance of heritage assets.

Paragraph 6.4.117 of the Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal acknowledges that Cholmeley Crescent has suffered from the introduction of inappropriate dormers and notes that such alterations detract from both the individual buildings and the wider conservation area.

The significance of the Highgate Conservation Area derives in part from the cohesive architectural rhythm, paired form and consistent roofscape of the semi-detached properties along Cholmeley Crescent. The front elevations and roofscape are highly visible within the public realm and make a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area. Conversely, rear roof slopes are less prominent in public views and accordingly make a more limited contribution to its significance.

The proposal seeks permission for a front dormer and the enlargement of the existing side and rear dormers. The proposed front dormer would be positioned on the principal roof slope in place of two existing rooflights and would measure approximately 2.7m in width and 2.2m in height. The proposed rear dormer would increase in width from approximately 4.3m to 6.2m and would include a Juliette balcony. The side dormer would be significantly extended, increasing from approximately 3.3m to 9.7m and creating a linked arrangement between the front and rear roof extensions.

Whilst examples of larger dormers exist elsewhere within the crescent, these are limited in number, pre-date current planning policy and do not establish a positive precedent. The examples at Nos. 53 and 55 Cholmeley Crescent are considered visually harmful additions within the streetscene and carry limited weight in the assessment of the current proposal. Similarly, the applicant's reference to the historic approval at No. 63 Cholmeley Crescent carries limited weight as that permission pre-dated the current policy framework and was never implemented.

The existing roof extensions at the application property already maximise much of the available roof space whilst retaining the principal front roof slope, front-facing gable and chimney stacks, all of which remain important elements of the building's architectural character. These features also contribute positively to the appearance of the semi-detached pair and wider streetscene.

The proposed alterations would substantially erode the remaining original roof form through the introduction of a large wrap-around roof extension extending across and between the existing roof slopes. Officers consider that the cumulative effect of the front dormer and enlarged side and rear dormers would create an over-dominant, cumbersome and visually intrusive roof addition that would appear as an additional storey rather than a subordinate roof extension.

The proposal would significantly diminish the legibility of the original roof form, disrupt the visual balance and symmetry of the semi-detached pair and further erode the consistent roofscape that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

The Conservation Officer has objected to the proposal on heritage grounds, concluding that it would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area. Officers agree with this assessment. Whilst the identified harm falls within the category of less than substantial harm as defined by the NPPF, great weight should nonetheless be afforded to the conservation of designated heritage assets. No public benefits have been identified that would outweigh the identified harm.

Accordingly, the proposal is considered to conflict with the policies outlined above.

Impact on Neighbourhood Amenity

London Plan Policy D6 requires development to avoid unacceptable impacts on the amenity of surrounding occupiers and to provide appropriate levels of daylight, sunlight and privacy whilst minimising adverse effects on neighbouring properties. Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD requires development proposals to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers, including maintaining appropriate levels of privacy and avoiding undue overlooking.

The proposed development is not considered to result in unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity. The site benefits from substantial separation distances to neighbouring properties, with the nearest dwelling located approximately 40 metres from the proposed rear-facing dormer. Whilst concerns have been raised regarding overlooking from the proposed Juliette balcony, having regard to the separation distance involved, the impacts would not be sufficient to warrant refusal.

A flank roof-level window already exists serving a bathroom. This proposal does not alter that opening and, were the application otherwise acceptable, a condition could secure obscure glazing and restricted opening in the interests of privacy. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of neighbouring amenity.

Conclusion

The proposed development would introduce a prominent front dormer and substantially enlarge the existing side and rear dormers, resulting in an over-dominant and visually intrusive roof extension that would erode the original roof form, disrupt the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and harm the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

Accordingly, the proposal is contrary to the development plan and is recommended for refusal, with all other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account.

7. CIL APPLICABLE

N/A – Under 100sqm and no new dwelling created.

8. RECOMMENDATION

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

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed front dormer and enlarged side and rear dormers, by reason of their scale, bulk, design and siting, would result in a dominant and visually intrusive roof extension that would fail to respect the character of the host dwelling, disrupt the symmetry of the semi-detached pair and harm the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, contrary to Policies DM1, DM9 & DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policies DH2 and DH5 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan and policies of the London Plan (2021).