



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1737
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	10 Elder Avenue, Hornsey, London, N8 9TH
Proposal:	Alterations to existing rear outrigger and erection of a single storey full-width rear extension with roof terrace above; erection of rear roof dormer extension; erection of first-floor rear extension; and installation of two rooflights to the front roofslope.
Case Officer:	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date:	18/06/2026
Applicant:	-
Agent:	Mr Tim Waters

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site relates to a two-storey mid-terrace dwellinghouse on the west side of Elder Avenue. The application site falls within the Crouch End conservation area and does not affect the setting of any listed building.

The area is residential in nature with this terrace having large rear gardens, with pairs of houses having their original outriggers intact. There are a number of sites in the terrace that have roof terraces in place to these outriggers, with some first-floor rear extensions also evident in the terrace.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is for alterations to the existing rear outrigger and the erection of a single-storey full-width rear extension with a roof terrace above; erection of a rear roof dormer extension; erection of a first-floor rear extension; and installation of two rooflights to the front roof slope.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/2026/1735 | Lawful development: (Proposed use) for the erection of a single storey rear extension and rear garden outbuilding, and installation of two rooflights to the front roof slope.
Permitted development

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:
LBH Conservation Officer:

- Removal of historic outrigger and erection a contemporary largely glazed full-width rear extension with an uncharacteristic roof terrace would result in a loss of originally built features and would obscure the original rear façade.
- The demolition of the original outrigger and construction of a full width extension are not supported in principle from heritage and would present harm to the conservation area
- The proposed dormer appears uncharacteristically large and has too much glazing, the principle of a dormer is acceptable provided it is scaled adequately.
- As originally submitted, the proposal would overall negatively impact the architectural and historic qualities of the host building and its group, harming the character of the Crouch End Conservation Area and cannot be supported from a heritage conservation perspective.

Neighbour Consultation

No representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application.

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & heritage

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, The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

Ground floor rear extension

It is noted that this proposal has been amended since the original submission, which received comments from LBH Conservation. These amendments consist of a significant reduction in the scale of the proposed terrace and the depth of the extension, along with a reduction in the level of glazing to the roof dormer. Further, there is an extant permission for the erection of a full-width rear extension 3m in depth (HGY/2026/1735), which acts as a fallback position in this case.

The proposed single-storey rear extension would be full-width, abutting the original outrigger, and would be 3m deep. The extension would directly abut the boundary with No. 12 Elder Avenue and would extend 3m along the shared boundary. It would have a flat roof with a maximum height of 2.8m (2.8m at the eaves). The proposed extension would be finished in materials to match the original building, apart from a large amount of contemporary glazing.

This form of glazing, while out of character with the original dwellinghouse, is typical for extensions of this type and is seen elsewhere in the terrace, such as at No. 8 Elder Avenue. As such, the use of this glazing in a location where it is not visible from the street is considered acceptable.

The principle of a full-width rear extension was not supported by LBH Conservation; however, the approved Certificate of Lawfulness for a 3m deep rear extension (HGY/2026/1735) is considered to act as a fallback position for the proposed massing of the extension. The approved certificate would see the original outrigger removed, and therefore this proposal is considered to better comply with DPD Policy DM9 as it retains an original architectural feature, minimising harm to the character of the building. As such, it is considered that this proposal presents a better option from a heritage conservation perspective than the extant fallback position and should be approved.

First floor rear extension

The proposed first-floor rear extension would be 3.27m in width, located above the original outrigger, and would be 1.22m deep. The extension would directly abut the boundary with No. 8 Elder Avenue and would extend 1.22m along the shared boundary. It would be scaled to match the first-floor rear extension in place at No. 8, creating a matched pair that would also match the depth of similar extensions in place at Nos. 2-4 Elder Avenue.

It is considered that this extension would be modest in scale and would follow the pattern of development in the area, creating a small amount of additional floorspace to the adjacent bedroom.

Dormer roof extension

The proposed dormer roof extension has also been amended since the initial consultation to reduce the level of glazing to the rear. It would be 4.69m wide by 3.53m deep, being set down from the ridge by 860mm and up from the eaves by 600mm. The dormer would also be set in from the boundary by 1150mm. It is considered that this dormer would sit appropriately within the roof slope, with a level of glazing that would match the floor below.

The proposal also includes two rooflights to the front roof slope. The addition of these would be acceptable provided they are of a 'conservation' style, and this is secured by way of a condition.

It is therefore considered that the proposed dormer and rooflights would appear subordinate to the host building and would be acceptable in design terms.

Roof terrace

The proposed roof terrace would be to the existing outrigger roof. It would be 3.1m wide and be 3m deep. The proposed roof terrace would be at first floor level and would abut a 1.8m tall party wall with a terrace in place at No. 8 Elder Avenue. It would have a metal balustrade without any privacy screen other than the existing party wall. The flooring is shown to be finished in tile/paving. It is also proposed to convert the existing northern first floor window to have a Juliet balcony, with a pair of double doors.

The siting and design of the proposed roof terrace is considered modest in scale and carefully designed in relation to the appearance of this building and would not appear visually obtrusive. It would preserve the existing roof form and complement the elevation on which the proposed roof terrace is located.

It is considered that the implementation of a Juliet balcony to the master bedroom would not harm the character of the host building, resulting in a minor increase in glazing over the existing

arrangement. Further, this change is to the rear and therefore not visible from the streetscene, minimising any harm to the character of the Conservation Area.

It is noted that there are a number of other terraces atop the outriggers of buildings in this area, with Nos. 4, 6, 8, and 12 each having some form of terrace covering or adjacent to the existing outrigger.

It is considered that the implementation of a terrace here would not harm the appearance of the host building and would follow the pattern of development in the area and should be approved.

Overall, with the extant fallback position considered, the proposed works as outlined above are considered proportionate and subordinate to the host building and would not harm the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area, leaving it preserved.

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.

Ground floor rear extension

The proposed ground floor extension would match that of the extant permitted development proposal, at a depth of 3m and a maximum height of 2.8m. This would therefore not adversely affect adjacent neighbours in terms of access to light or overshadowing and would be acceptable.

Dormer window

It is considered that the addition of a dormer window would not result in any adverse impact on neighbouring amenity. The potential for overlooking into adjacent gardens is similar to that of upper floor windows, and there are a number of dormer windows in place within the terrace. Further, the proposed dormer is scaled such that it could be achieved via permitted development rights and is therefore considered acceptable in terms of neighbouring amenity.

Roof terrace

The proposed roof terrace would be approximately 3m x 3m and would be flanked to the southeast by a 1.8m wall adjoining with No. 8 Elder Avenue. The north and western sides of the terrace would have a metal balustrade 1.1m in height that would provide limited screening.

Regarding the adjoining residential properties, the gardens of the application site and adjoining sites are large and very deep, creating long sightlines to opposing buildings that would reduce the perception of overlooking. In terms of views into the gardens of No. 8 Elder Avenue, these would be reduced by the existing separating wall and the level of greenery within the garden of No. 8. It is also considered that the distance between the terrace and the garden of No. 12, together with the modest scale of the proposed terrace, would not result in a loss of privacy beyond that which already arises from upper-floor windows of the application site. It is therefore considered that the

presence of users on the terrace area in close proximity to neighbouring windows would be unlikely to cause the perception of a loss of privacy in adjoining residential properties.

It is noted that the proposed roof terrace may provide the opportunity for gatherings. Given its modest size, there would be less likelihood of noise reaching intrusive levels. Although an hours of use condition on external space is often attached in respect of commercial properties, to do so in respect of a residential property would be difficult to enforce and unduly restrictive when the same does not apply to neighbouring properties.

It is considered that the proposed change to Juliet balcony would not result in an uplift of overlooking compared to the existing window, as the additional glazing would be part screened by the balustrade. Additionally, Juliet balconies offer little opportunity for gathering but rather serve to allow additional light and airflow into the adjacent room.

It is considered that the proposed additions would not result in any harm to neighbouring amenity, being compliant with DPD Policy DM1 and can be approved.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposal is considered acceptable in respect of its character, appearance and impact on the site and would not result in material harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions.

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Approved drawings list:

PC.01B, PC.012B, PC.03B, PC.04B, PC.05B, PC.06B

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building, unless shown otherwise on approved plans

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the

locality consistent with Policy D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

- 4 The proposed rooflight(s) hereby approved shall be 'Conservation style', flush with the roof plane in which they are installed, and shall be maintained as such for the lifespan of the development.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday

8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.