



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1243
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	63 Princes Avenue, Wood Green, London, N22 7SB
Proposal:	Loft conversion including the erection of a L-shaped rear roof dormer and 3no. front rooflights, and installation of a spiral staircase at the rear.
Case Officer:	Mark Chan
Valid Date:	05/05/2026
Applicant:	Mr Graeme McAulay
Agent:	Mr Felix Padfield

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This is an application for a loft conversion including the erection of an L-shaped rear roof dormer, installation of three front rooflights and the installation of a spiral staircase providing access to the rear garden.

2. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site comprises the upper maisonette within a two-storey end-of-terrace property located on the western side of Princes Avenue. The building forms part of an attractive Edwardian terrace of 10 properties characterised by traditional brick detailing, projecting bays, chimney stacks and substantial two-storey rear outriggers. The adjoining properties at Nos. 57 and 59 Princes Avenue are situated on slightly higher ground and separated from the application property by a narrow gap.

To the rear, the property contains a deep and wide two-storey outrigger which reflects the established form of development along this section of Princes Avenue. The site is not located within a Conservation Area.

3. PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

The planning and enforcement history of the site has been reviewed and taken into account in the determination of this application.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

No consultation responses were received.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application was publicised by way of neighbour notification letters, site notice and press advertisement. One objection was received raising the following concerns:

1. Toof extension is excessively large and would appear overly dominant and out of character with the host building.
2. Proposal would result in the loss of original architectural features, including chimneys and other period detailing.
3. Proposed flank walls are considered insufficiently set back from the eaves, resulting in excessive visual bulk.
4. Proposed spiral staircase would result in overlooking, noise and disturbance to neighbouring occupiers and their gardens.

6. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

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

Design and Appearance

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD seek to enhance the built environment through high-quality design that respects local context and the positive characteristics of the area. Policy DM1 requires development to relate positively to its locality in terms of height, form, scale, massing, building lines, architectural detailing and style.

DPD Policy DM12 (*Housing Design and Quality*) states that extensions and alterations to residential buildings, including roof alterations, should be of a high-quality, site-specific and sensitive design and should respect and complement the form, setting, period and architectural characteristics of the original building. High-quality matching or complementary materials should also be used where appropriate.

The proposal seeks permission for a loft conversion comprising an L-shaped rear dormer extension, including a dormer to the main rear roofslope and a smaller dormer above the existing two-storey rear outrigger. The proposal also includes three rooflights to the front roofslope and a spiral staircase providing access to the rear garden. The dormers would be clad in vertical hanging slate tiles and incorporate powder-coated aluminium windows. The dormer on the main roof slope would involve extending the current brick flank wall upwards.

The concerns raised regarding the scale of the extension are noted. While the L-shaped dormer represents a significant addition to the roofspace, it must be considered in the context of the host property. The application property benefits from a particularly deep and wide two-storey rear outrigger which already forms a substantial and dominant component of the rear elevation and equally the gap to the side of the flank wall is narrow as such not allowing for the full extent of the flank wall to be appreciated from the street. As a consequence, the ability to read and appreciate the full extent of the proposed roof extension from surrounding viewpoints is limited.

From neighbouring gardens and rear outlooks, the prevailing visual feature will continue to be the substantial two-storey outrigger and its pitched roof. The established silhouette and outline of this built form, which is characteristic of the rear elevations throughout Princes Avenue, would remain readily appreciable following construction of the development. Accordingly, while the extension is substantial, it would not appear unduly dominant or visually intrusive in its context.

It is also noted that comparable L-shaped roof extensions are present on a number of neighbouring and nearby properties, including within Princes Avenue. The proposal therefore reflects an established pattern of development and would not appear incongruous within the wider streetscape or rear townscape.

It is acknowledged that concerns have been raised regarding the limited setback of parts of the dormer extension from the eaves and flank wall. While examples of roof extensions with greater setbacks can be found elsewhere, there is no requirement for a uniform setback dimension. The acceptability of the proposal must be assessed on its own merits. In this instance, having regard to the substantial depth and width of the existing two-storey rear outrigger, the resulting form of development would not appear unduly bulky or dominant. Furthermore, due to the limited visibility of these elements from the public realm and the established presence of comparable roof extensions within the area, the relationship between the dormer and the eaves is not considered to result in material harm to the character or appearance of the host building or wider area.

Regarding the loss of architectural features, the proposed works would necessitate the removal of the chimneys associated with the rear outrigger. The Local Planning Authority acknowledges that this results in the loss of original building fabric. However, these chimney stacks are located to the rear of the property, are not visible from the public realm and make only a limited contribution to the wider character of the area. The property is not located within a Conservation Area and many properties within the terrace and surrounding area have removed rear outrigger chimneys over time, often through works which would not have required planning permission.

Concerns have also been raised that the removal of the rear chimney stack could affect the future use of fireplaces serving the lower flat. While this concern is noted, the planning assessment is principally concerned with the external appearance of the development and its impact on the character of the building and surrounding area. The potential future use of an existing fireplace is not considered to be a matter that would justify withholding planning permission in this instance.

Importantly, the principal chimney stack serving the main roof slope would be retained. This chimney remains visible from Princes Avenue and continues to contribute positively to the character, rhythm and roofscape of the terrace. The most publicly visible and significant historic roof feature would therefore remain intact.

The proposed front rooflights are modestly scaled and appropriately positioned. Similar rooflights are evident on surrounding properties and would not detract from the appearance of the building or wider area.

The proposal also includes the installation of a galvanised steel spiral staircase providing direct access from the first-floor flat to the rear garden. While external staircases of this nature are not a common feature within Princes Avenue, it is noted that the staircase has been designed as a compact spiral structure with a limited footprint and lightweight appearance. As such, it would appear less prominent than a conventional straight-flight staircase. The staircase would provide a practical means of access between the upper-floor accommodation and rear garden and would improve accessibility to the garden compared with the existing steep internal stair arrangement. Owing to its modest scale, spiral design and rearward location, the staircase would not result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the host building or surrounding area.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in design and appearance terms and accords with Policies SP11, DM1 and DM12.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

London Plan Policy D6 states that development should not result in unacceptable impacts on the amenity of surrounding occupiers and should ensure appropriate levels of daylight, sunlight and privacy. DPD Policy DM1 (*Delivering High-Quality Design*) requires development proposals to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers. In particular, proposals should

provide appropriate levels of sunlight and daylight and avoid undue overlooking, loss of privacy or other harmful impacts.

The proposed flank window to the dormer would be obscure glazed and fixed shut below 1.7m above finished floor level, preventing direct overlooking towards neighbouring properties.

The proposal would largely be situated above the existing roof structure and substantial two-storey rear outrigger. Given the nature of the development and the fact that no significant additional built form is introduced at lower levels, the proposal would not give rise to a material loss of daylight or sunlight to neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the adjoining properties at Nos. 57 and 59 Princes Avenue are separated from the host building by a narrow gap and sit at a slightly higher ground level, reducing any perception of enclosure. The development would retain the established silhouette of the existing two-storey rear outrigger and would not appear unduly overbearing when viewed from neighbouring properties or gardens.

Having regard to the siting, height and design of the proposed dormers, the development would not result in unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, loss of daylight, loss of sunlight or an undue sense of enclosure.

The proposed spiral staircase has been constructed and while it would provide access from the first-floor flat to the rear garden, it would function solely as a means of circulation and would not create a balcony, terrace or area intended for prolonged occupation. Users would occupy the staircase only for short periods whilst moving between the dwelling and garden. Furthermore, the existing first-floor flat already benefits from rear-facing windows overlooking the garden area. Consequently, the staircase would not introduce a materially greater degree of overlooking than presently exists. Given its limited use and modest size, it is also not considered that the staircase would result in unacceptable levels of noise or disturbance to neighbouring occupiers.

The proposal is therefore considered acceptable in terms of neighbouring residential amenity.

7. CONCLUSION

While the objection received has been carefully considered, it is not considered that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character or appearance of the host building, the wider area or neighbouring residential amenity. The development reflects an established pattern of roof extensions within the locality and would preserve the ability to appreciate the existing form and silhouette of the building whilst retaining the principal chimney visible from the public realm. As such, the proposal is considered to accord with the policies outlined above.

All other relevant policies and material considerations, including equalities impacts, have been taken into account. Planning permission should therefore be granted.

8. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION, subject to 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 listed below, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission or where alternative details have been subsequently approved following an application for a non-material amendment.

Existing 63 Princes Avenue N22 7SB-4.pdf
DAS 63 Princes Ave N22 7SB loft extension.pdf
Proposed 63 Princes Avenue N22 7SB-4.pdf
Location plan 63 Princes Avenue N22 7SB-4.pdf

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

- 3 The development hereby approved shall be constructed in accordance with the materials specified on the approved drawings, including vertical hung slate roof tiles, powder-coated aluminium windows and a galvanised steel external spiral staircase. The altered flank wall shall be faced in brickwork to match the colour, size, texture and appearance of the existing host building.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development, safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties, and preserve the character and appearance of the locality, in accordance 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).

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: 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.

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.