



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/3045
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	79 Grosvenor Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2DU
Proposal:	Proposed loft extension with rear roof dormer to 2nd floor outrigger.
Case Officer:	Ben Coffie
Valid Date:	13/11/2023
Applicant:	Amy and Tom Morris
Agent:	Mr George Beedle

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The site is situated on the southern side of Grosvenor Road, within the Vallance Road Conservation Area. The site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse with two storey rear outrigger and a single storey rear extension.

The street is predominantly residential in character with a mix of dwellings with varying typologies and design. The dwellings have their own unique features and in the case of the site, it is characterised by a gabled roof, front bay feature and a rear two storey outrigger.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for a loft extension with rear roof dormer to 2nd floor outrigger. The proposed roof extension would have its main bulk with a smaller window projection measuring 0.7m deep, 2.3m high and 2.9m wide. The main bulk of the extension will project 4.5m in depth and will measure a height of 3m with a maximum width of 3.8m.

Prior to this submission a preapplication advice was sought (PRE/2022/0260), and as set out in the preapplication advice there is no in principle objection to a roof extension on the outrigger, provided that this is well set back and does not cover the entirety of the outrigger and it is of high-quality design and materials. The current proposal shows the smaller window projection is less deep however the main bulk of the roof has increased.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

· HGY/2018/2604
Address: 79, Grosvenor Road, London, N10 2DU
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side/rear extension,
Decision Date: 10 October 2018
Decision: Approve
with Conditions

· HGY/2022/1950
Address: 79, Grosvenor Road, London, N10 2DU
Proposal: Proposed ground floor rear and side infill extension.,
Decision Date: 26 August 2022
Decision: Approve
with Conditions

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

LBH Conservation Officer: The section of remaining roof is very small, and the height and mass of the proposed addition would make it relatively imposing and prominent feature and would be considered to cause some less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area(s). Accordingly in its current form Conservation does not support this proposal.

Local amenity groups

The following local groups/societies made representations: N/A

Neighbour Consultation

The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 11

Objecting: 0

Support: 0

Neither: 0

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

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,

Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

The application site is part of a group of dwellings where their rear elevations visible from both Windermere Road and Muswell Avenue, which are both part of the Muswell Hill and Valence Conservation Areas. The more sensitive view is from Windermere Road as it is closer and less altered with good quality and consistent Edwardian architecture are essential components of the character and appearance of the streetscene. This is likely to be affected by the loft extension, particularly as the proposed development extends above and over the existing brick parapet which forms the party boundary.

The massing of the proposed roof extension has increased and would occupy more roof area of the outrigger and therefore is considered excessive. As such, the proposal is considered disproportionate to the roof slope and insubordinate to the host building. It would be out of character with the design of the host and neighbouring buildings and out of keeping with the existing pattern of development.

As it has been established, the proposal will be highly visible, the section of remaining roof is very small, and the height and mass of the proposed addition would make it relatively imposing and prominent feature. Therefore, the local character and visual amenity of the Muswell Hill and Valence Road Conservation Areas would be adversely impacted.

As such, the proposal would not comply with Policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan 2017 and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would be unacceptable in heritage terms.

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.

The location of the proposed roof extension at roof level is considered acceptable and would not result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight, or have an overbearing appearance to the neighbouring dwellings at Nos 75 and 81 Grosvenor Road and 75 Windermere Road. There would not be material loss of privacy Nos 75 and 81 Grosvenor Road and 75 Windermere Road. The proposal is acceptable in amenity terms.

The proposed roof extension would introduce additional glazing at roof level, however there would be no significant increase in the extent of overlooking over and above the extant situation.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed development is not in accordance with Policies DM1, DMP9 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policies SP11 and SP12 of

Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also does not accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

The proposal is considered unacceptable in respect of its character, appearance however 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 refused for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed roof extension would be by reason of its excessive bulk be unacceptably harmful in terms of the appearance of the site, street-scene and character of the Muswell Hill and Valence Road Conservation Areas, contrary to DPD Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 and London Plan Policy HC1 and D3.