



Officer Report

Application Number: HGY/2024/0908
Application Type: Full planning permission
Address: Flat A, 10 Hornsey Lane Gardens, Hornsey, London, N6 5PB
Proposal: Erection of a front dormer extension to replace the existing
Case Officer: Sabelle Adjagboni
Valid Date: 02/04/2024
Applicant: Mr Ludovic Lacay
Agent: Mr Yazen Hasi

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Proposed development

This is an application for a loft conversion including the construction of a front dormer to replace the existing.

2. Site and Surroundings

The application site is a top flat of a two-storey mid-terrace property containing two flats. It is located on the western end of Hornsey Lane Gardens. The site falls within the Highgate conservation area but is not a listed building. A few properties on the terrace and in close proximity to the site can be seen to have front dormers.

3. Consultation response

Comments were received from the LBH Conservation team and are summarised as follows:

Raised above sloping front gardens, Nos. 2-20 have varied forms of bay window, some houses with triangular oriels above the entrance bays. Most retain original leaded window glazing and front doors with circular windows and fanlights above containing coloured glass. The timber eaves have exposed rafter ends and the entrances have flat canopies with wrought-iron suspension rods. Most retain brick garden walls with inset flint panels. While the façades are generally well preserved, the cohesion has been affected by several over scaled dormers and the loss of one front garden to form a basement garage. Despite some of these poor-quality additions the terrace Nos. 2-20, is considered to positively contribute to the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

The existing house has a modern front dormer which detracts from the appreciation of the original buildings form, though it is not as poor an example as several other sized examples seen nearby. These existing poor quality full-width front elevation dormers are the ones which are referenced in the submitted design and access statement and all pre-date the current local plan and the NPPF. The significance of the Conservation Area should not be further eroded by repeating harmful alterations.

A full width front dormer, located on a building which is located on a slope (as seen with the existing) would create a dominant feature making the front elevation top-heavy and significantly

eroding the ability to appreciate the original form and features of the original building. The proposed dormer would be a poor-quality addition which would further erode the appreciation of the original terrace, its form and features and this would be considered to cause some less than substantial harm to the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area and it should be considered in line with paragraphs 200, 205 and 208 of the NPPF and local plan policy DM9(b). Accordingly, conservation do not support this application.

Comments were received from the Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee (HCAAC) and are summarised as follows:

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee objects very strongly indeed to the proposal to add a very large front dormer on this property. This would be contrary to numerous policies which apply to Highgate Conservation Area, as noted below.

The large neighbouring dormer should not serve as a precedent as it was built long before current policies were introduced and would not be permitted if applied for today.

For instance, the proposed dormer is clearly contrary to the policy on dormers outlined on p167 of the HCA Character Appraisal and Management Plan (2013) - "Roof Forms and Extensions".

Front dormers are considered "generally unsuitable" because of their detrimental effect on the conservation area. And even if this dormer was on the back of the roof it would be too large, as dormers should be set in from the eaves, ridge and sides of the roof by at least 1m. It is not subordinate to the existing roof.

The proposed front dormer is also against Highgate Neighbourhood Plan policies DH2 and DH5. Notwithstanding the large dormer built on the neighbouring house, front dormers are not part of the "established local character" of this part of the conservation area and hence the proposal is unacceptable.

The proposals are also contrary to policy DM9 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

We believe very strongly that front dormers detract from the Highgate Conservation Area and that this application should be refused.

4. Local representations

The application was publicised by way of site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 8 letters to neighbours. No representations were received.

5. Material planning considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, &
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and appearance and 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 Highgate Neighbourhood Plan policy DH2 states that development proposals, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Highgate's conservation areas, and respect the setting of its listed buildings and other heritage assets.

The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan policy DH5 states that roof extensions, dormers and rooflights should respect the existing roof form in terms of design, scale, materials and detail and be restricted to the rear except where they are part of the established local character and a new extension or dormer would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the area or the significance of heritage assets; re-roofing materials should avoid use of inappropriate substitute materials that can erode the character and appearance of buildings and areas. Chimneystacks should be retained where they positively contribute to the character of the conservation area. Satellite dishes and other telecommunications equipment should be located discreetly, and not be sited at the front of buildings on the roofline in the conservation areas.

The site currently benefits from a small dormer which the proposal seeks to increase to improve the residential amenities of the residents by optimising the bedroom spaces including providing an en-suite. The proposed front dormer would be practically the full width of the house and would sit below the ridge line and slightly above the eaves line. With this, very little of the original roof plan would remain exposed. The proposal also features two new windows that fail to relate to the fenestration design and pattern to the floors below.

Although, it is noted that there are some front dormers on the street, as mentioned in the HCAAC and LBH Conservation Officer's comments, these are historic and were built before current policies were adopted and are not of specific design quality viewed to be acceptable. It is accepted there are some examples of later front dormers on Milton Park nearby, however these are appropriate in terms of size, design and fenestration as well as not dominating the roof slope in question.

As such viewed within this context and considering the prominent location of the dormer to the front of this property, visible from public vantage points, the scheme would be discordant and incongruous in relation to the existing building and would be visually intrusive in the street scene. In consequence, it would harm the character and appearance of surroundings and would detract from the historic and architectural qualities of the Conservation Area.

It is acknowledged that the proposal would help meet other objectives by providing improved living space. Nevertheless, the amount of extra space to be provided would be small, hence, the harm that would be done to the street scene outweigh the benefits of the project.

As such, in design and heritage terms, the proposal is considered at odds with the above policies.

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. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

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 amenity of neighbouring resident.

The proposed windows on the front elevation of the roof extension would be street facing. Given the trees in front of the site and the distance from properties on the other side of the road, there would be no significant increase in the extent of overlooking over and above the extant situation.

Overall, the proposal will have no material impact on amenity, in terms of privacy, conditions of daylight and sunlight, and outlook.

Conclusion

The proposal is not considered acceptable in terms of design and heritage.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

5. CIL Applicable

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

6. Recommendation

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s)

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed extension of the roof by reason of its size, design and prominence in the street scene, would result in an over dominant, incongruous and discordant addition to this property, detracting from its appearance and harming the street scene, and failing to protect the character and appearance to this part of Highgate conservation area contrary to Policy D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies DH2 and DH5 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, Policy SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Plan, Development Plan Document 2017.