

Architects & Chartered Architectural Technologist Practice

Detailed Planning Ltd, Greenside House
50 Station Road
London N22 7DE

info@etailed-planning.co.uk
www.detailed-planning.co.uk
020 8150 0494

Planning, Heritage & Design and Access Statement

House renovation to include rear dormer size increase, fenestration alterations to include a new rear terrace, redesign to existing extension and front lightwell to facilitate basement upgrades.

125 Rosebery Road, London, N10 2LD

Client Ref: **2604OM**
Agent: **Chris Watkins BSc (Hons) MCIAT**
Date: **September 2026**

INTRODUCTION & SITE HERITAGE

1. This Planning Statement has been prepared in support of a householder planning application for alterations and improvements to the existing dwelling at 125 Rosebery Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2LD.
2. The proposal comprises house renovation works including an enlargement and redesign of the existing rear dormer, alterations to fenestration to facilitate the formation of a new rear terrace, the redesign of the existing rear extension and alterations to the front lightwell to facilitate upgrades to the existing basement accommodation.
3. The application property is a two-storey terraced dwelling located on the eastern side of Rosebery Road. The site lies within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area but the building itself is not listed. The Council identifies Muswell Hill as a designated conservation area and has published a specific Conservation Area Character Appraisal for the area.
4. Pre-application advice was obtained from the London Borough of Haringey prior to submission under reference PRE/2026/0121. The pre-application meeting took place on 19 May 2026 and involved both planning and conservation officers. The application scheme has subsequently been amended in direct response to the matters raised through that process.
5. The principal changes made following the pre-application advice include the repositioning of the proposed rear dormer further away from the eaves and higher on the rear roof slope, the reduction and visual reconsideration of the proposed front lightwell, and the incorporation of side privacy screening to the proposed rear terrace.
6. The purpose of this Statement is to explain the planning and design rationale for the proposal and demonstrate why the revised development is considered acceptable having regard to the site's conservation area designation, the character of the host property and surrounding terrace, residential amenity and the relevant planning policy framework.

PLANNING STATEMENT

Planning Policy Context

7. The principal local planning policies considered relevant to this proposal include Haringey Development Management Policies DM1, DM9 and DM18.
8. Policy DM1, Delivering High Quality Design, forms part of Haringey's Development Management DPD and establishes the Council's approach to achieving high-quality design. Policy DM9 addresses the management of the historic environment, while Policy DM18 specifically relates to residential basement development and light wells. These policies are directly relevant to the proposed works and their consideration is appropriate given the nature of the development and the site's location within a conservation area.
9. The Council's published conservation evidence base also includes the Muswell Hill Conservation Area Character Appraisal. This forms an important source of guidance when considering the effect of development upon the character and appearance of the conservation area.
10. The Council's own guidance confirms the importance of preserving and improving the character and appearance of conservation areas and recognises that development proposals within such areas require careful consideration of their heritage context.

Site Context and Heritage Considerations

11. The application property forms part of an established residential terrace within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. The pre-application advice describes the wider locality as containing dwellings dating from the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, many of which exhibit distinctive architectural and decorative detailing. These features make an important contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
12. The proposal does not seek to alter the established residential use of the property or fundamentally change the character of the site. Instead, it seeks to improve and modernise the existing dwelling through a series of targeted interventions.
13. The principal planning consideration is therefore whether the individual and cumulative effects of the proposed alterations would preserve the character and appearance of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area while maintaining acceptable residential amenity for neighbouring occupiers.
14. The application has been developed through a process of engagement with the Council's planning and conservation officers. The revised design is materially informed by the site-specific feedback received during the pre-application process.

Pre-Application Advice and Design Development

15. The pre-application response is an important consideration in the evolution of the proposed development. It provided detailed advice regarding the rear dormer, proposed roof terrace, ground floor extension, basement works, front lightwell and neighbouring residential amenity.

16. Although the pre-application advice does not constitute a formal planning decision, it provided a clear indication of the principal matters requiring attention before the submission of a planning application. The applicant has sought to address those matters directly rather than simply resubmitting the original scheme.

Rear Dormer

17. The pre-application proposal sought to replace the existing rear dormer with a significantly larger full-width dormer on the lower rear roof slope. Officers acknowledged that a number of properties within this section of Rosebery Road have benefited from larger rear dormers and that such additions form part of the established pattern of development within the terrace. Officers therefore raised no objection in principle to the provision of a larger rear dormer.

18. The principal concern related to the depth and siting of the original proposal. Officers considered that the dormer extended too close to the rear building line and would consequently appear overly dominant when viewed from the rear. The Council advised that the dormer should be pulled back from the rear elevation and positioned further up the roof slope to retain a greater extent of the original roof form beneath it.

19. The application scheme responds directly to this advice. The proposed rear dormer has been set further away from the eaves and repositioned higher on the roof slope. This allows a greater proportion of the original roof to remain visible and provides a more subordinate and balanced relationship between the extension and the host dwelling.

20. The revised dormer therefore seeks to retain the benefit of improved accommodation within the roof space while addressing the specific concern that the original design could appear excessively dominant.

21. This design evolution is considered particularly important given the conservation area location. By retaining a clearer expression of the original roof form, the revised proposal better respects the architectural composition of the host property and the wider terrace.

Rear Roof Terrace and Fenestration Alterations

22. The proposal includes the formation of a rear terrace above the existing rear projection. Access to the terrace would be provided through alterations to the existing rear-facing fenestration.

23. The pre-application advice recognised that the loss of the existing sash window arrangement and formation of a larger opening would not be an ideal alteration from a heritage perspective because it would alter existing window proportions and detailing. However, officers also recognised that

neighbouring and nearby properties within the immediate area have incorporated roof terraces above similar rear projections. The Council therefore concluded that the principle of a roof terrace in this location was not unacceptable.

24. The principal concern identified by officers related to neighbouring privacy. The pre-application advice specifically recommended the incorporation of suitable screening to address opportunities for overlooking towards adjacent properties and nearby first-floor windows.

25. The application scheme has incorporated side screening to the proposed terrace in direct response to this advice. The screening forms an integral part of the submitted proposal and is intended to limit harmful overlooking from the terrace towards neighbouring properties.

26. The proposed mitigation directly addresses the principal amenity concern identified by officers. Subject to the detailed design shown on the submitted drawings, the terrace is therefore considered capable of providing private external amenity space without giving rise to an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring privacy.

Rear Extension Alterations

27. The proposal includes the redesign of the existing rear extension, including a reconfiguration of its roof form and the introduction of a mono-pitched glazed roof element.

28. The pre-application advice considered the proposed ground floor alterations acceptable in principle. Officers concluded that the revised design would remain subordinate to the host dwelling and would represent an improvement over the existing arrangement. The Council further advised that the proposals did not raise concerns in relation to design quality, heritage impact or neighbouring amenity, subject to appropriate detailing and material specification.

29. This represents a positive starting point for the assessment of the application scheme. The proposal does not seek to introduce an unduly prominent or dominant addition but instead redesigns the existing arrangement to provide a more coherent and improved relationship with the host building.

Basement Development

30. The proposal includes the lowering of part of the existing basement floor level and associated works to improve the quality and functionality of the basement accommodation.

31. The Council's pre-application advice distinguished the proposed development from schemes involving the formation of entirely new basements or substantial excavation beneath the footprint of a dwelling. Officers considered the proposed works relatively modest in scale and advised that, on the basis of the information submitted at that stage, a Basement Impact Assessment would not ordinarily be required.

32. The Council nevertheless advised that the Planning Statement should clearly explain the nature and extent of the basement works and confirm that they would be undertaken in accordance with recognised industry best practice and appropriate engineering standards. The Council also indicated

that a condition requiring supervision by a suitably qualified structural engineer may be imposed should planning permission be granted.

33. The proposed basement works should therefore be understood as targeted alterations to improve existing accommodation rather than a major subterranean development. The applicant acknowledges the importance of appropriate structural and engineering oversight during the detailed design and construction stages.

Front Lightwell

34. The front lightwell formed a significant part of the pre-application discussion. The original scheme proposed a substantial lightwell around the front bay window, approximately 3.91 metres wide and 1.2 metres deep, with metal railings providing fall protection.

35. Officers considered that the original lightwell would effectively create a sunken front garden that would be uncharacteristic of the street. The proposed railings were also considered likely to be visually intrusive and incompatible with the character of the front forecourt.

36. The Council advised that the visual prominence of the lightwell should be reduced. The application scheme has responded by reducing the lightwell and changing the manner in which it is viewed from the street.

37. This represents a material improvement to the design approach. The revised proposal seeks to retain the functional benefits associated with improving the basement space while responding more sensitively to the established character of the front garden and streetscape.

38. The revised approach is considered more consistent with the objective of ensuring that the proposed basement-related works do not result in an unnecessarily intrusive or dominant intervention within the conservation area.

Neighbouring Residential Amenity

39. The effect of the development upon neighbouring residential amenity has been specifically considered through the pre-application process. The Council identified the occupiers of Nos. 123 and 127 Rosebery Road as the neighbouring residents most likely to be affected by the proposal and considered the potential effects upon outlook, daylight, sunlight and enclosure.

40. In relation to No. 127, officers noted that the rear extension would remain on the southern boundary and would not result in additional adverse effects upon outlook or daylight and sunlight.

41. In relation to No. 123, officers noted that although a new mono-pitched roof was proposed, the flat roof section would retain the existing height and depth of the extension along the shared boundary. The Council concluded that the proposal would therefore not result in a greater impact on residential amenity than the existing situation.

42. The Council further concluded that the remaining elements of the pre-application proposal were not considered to adversely affect neighbouring residential amenity. The application scheme

incorporates an additional and direct response to the privacy considerations associated with the proposed rear terrace through the provision of side screening. This mitigation is intended to reduce opportunities for overlooking and ensure that the use of the terrace does not result in unacceptable harm to neighbouring privacy.

43. Having regard to the Council's pre-application assessment and the amendments made to the scheme, the proposal is not considered to give rise to unacceptable impacts in respect of overlooking, loss of privacy, outlook, daylight, sunlight or enclosure.

Heritage and Conservation Area Impact

44. The site's location within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area requires particular attention to the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

45. The application has been developed with this sensitivity in mind. The principal elements capable of affecting the appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding townscape have been reconsidered through the pre-application process.

46. The rear dormer has been repositioned to retain a greater extent of the original roof form and reduce its visual dominance. The front lightwell has been reduced and visually reconsidered to minimise its prominence within the street scene. The rear extension has been considered acceptable in principle by officers, while the roof terrace incorporates specific screening to address its relationship with neighbouring properties.

47. The proposal does involve alterations to the rear fenestration associated with the formation of the terrace. The heritage implications of these changes were expressly acknowledged through the pre-application process. However, the Council also recognised the established presence of similar roof terraces within the surrounding area and did not consider the principle of the proposal unacceptable.

48. Taken as a whole, the application scheme represents a revised and more responsive design than the scheme originally considered at pre-application stage. The amendments specifically address the principal concerns raised by the Council and seek to minimise the visual and heritage effects of the development.

DESIGN AND ACCESS STATEMENT

Use

49. The property would remain in use as a single private dwelling. No change of use or subdivision of the property is proposed.

Amount

50. The development comprises alterations and extensions to an existing dwelling. It does not introduce a new dwelling or materially change the established residential pattern of the area.

51. The scale and extent of the individual interventions have been reconsidered through the pre-application process to ensure that the amount of development remains appropriate to the host building and its conservation area setting.

Layout

52. The established layout of the dwelling would remain substantially unchanged. The proposal instead seeks to improve the functionality and quality of the existing accommodation and external spaces.

53. The rear terrace, basement improvements and redesigned rear extension are positioned in relation to the existing building and do not require a fundamental reorganisation of the site.

Scale

54. Scale has been a central consideration in the design development, particularly in relation to the rear dormer and front lightwell.

55. The dormer has been set further away from the eaves and repositioned higher on the roof slope to reduce its visual dominance and retain a greater extent of the original roof form.

56. The front lightwell has been reduced in scale and visually reconsidered to provide a more proportionate intervention within the front garden and streetscape.

Landscaping

57. The proposal does not involve substantial landscaping works. However, the treatment of the front garden and forecourt has been considered as part of the lightwell design because these spaces contribute to the character of the conservation area.

58. The revised approach seeks to minimise visual disruption to the front garden and retain an appropriate relationship between the dwelling and the established street scene.

Appearance

59. The appearance of the proposal has been informed by the character of the host building, the established pattern of the surrounding terrace and the site's location within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

60. The revised dormer, redesigned rear extension and reconsidered front lightwell have all been developed to provide a more sensitive and balanced architectural response.

Access

61. The established means of access to the dwelling would remain in place. The proposal would not alter the principal pedestrian access arrangements from Rosebery Road.

62. Access to the proposed terrace would be provided from within the existing dwelling, while the basement alterations would improve the functionality of the existing lower-ground accommodation.

CONCLUSION

63. The proposed development represents a carefully considered programme of improvements to the existing dwelling at 125 Rosebery Road.

64. The proposal has been informed by formal pre-application engagement with Haringey Council's planning and conservation officers. The application scheme has subsequently been amended in direct response to the advice received.

65. The proposed rear dormer has been repositioned further away from the eaves and higher on the roof slope to retain a greater extent of the original roof form and reduce its visual dominance. The front lightwell has been reduced and visually reconsidered in response to concerns regarding its original prominence within the front garden and street scene.

66. The proposed rear terrace responds to the Council's amenity advice through the incorporation of side privacy screening. The redesigned rear extension was considered acceptable in principle at pre-application stage, and the Council's assessment did not identify unacceptable impacts on the residential amenity of the adjoining occupiers.

67. The proposed basement works are modest in scope and relate to the improvement of existing accommodation. The pre-application advice indicated that a Basement Impact Assessment would not ordinarily be required on the basis of the information considered, while recognising the importance of appropriate engineering and structural oversight.

68. The revised proposal is therefore considered to represent a proportionate and sensitive response to the opportunities and constraints of the site. It has been designed to improve the quality and functionality of the existing dwelling while responding to the character and appearance of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area and safeguarding neighbouring residential amenity.

69. It is respectfully submitted that the proposal accords with the relevant objectives of Haringey's Development Management policies relating to high-quality design, the historic environment and residential basement development, and that planning permission should therefore be granted.

70. Should the Local Planning Authority require any further clarification regarding the proposal or the matters addressed within this Planning Statement, the applicant's agent would be pleased to provide any additional information required.

SITE PHOTOS

