



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0881
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	9 Grasmere Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2DH
Proposal:	Loft dormer conversion to rear main roof and rear outrigger roof, and installation of front facing roof windows.
Case Officer:	Emily Whittredge
Valid Date:	28/03/2024
Applicant:	Mr Alastair Bowers
Agent:	Mr Jon Pyle

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

Permission is sought for a loft conversion comprising a rear dormer and rear outrigger roof extensions, and installation of three front roof windows. The dormer would be full-width and the outrigger extension would project 6.3m from the dormer. The development would be clad in grey slates and would feature grey uPVC windows.

Site and Surroundings

The application relates to a two storey mid-terrace dwelling on the south west side of Grasmere Road within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. The property has previously been extended at roof level with a small dormer.

The terrace is characterised by large, two storey closet wings, and many have rear dormer extensions. Recently, permission has been granted for a number of dormer and outrigger loft conversions with front roof lights, of a generally consistent character.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows:

HGY/2010/0789,

Proposal: Erection of rear dormer window with insertion of 3 x conservation roof lights to front roof slope.,

Decision Date: 21 June 2010

Decision: Approve with Conditions

HGY/2015/0127,

Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension to rear ground floor and rear ground floor window seat (householder application),

Decision Date: 10 March 2015
Decision: Approve with Conditions

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

No responses were received following consultation on the application.

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of letters, a press notice and site notice. No representations have been received from neighbours and/or local groups, in response to notification and publicity of the application.

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

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

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

London Plan (2021) policies emphasise the importance of high-quality and seek to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach. Policy D4 'Delivering good design' states that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Local Plan Policy SP11 (2017) and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects local context and character to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to meet a range of criteria having regard to the following: building heights; form, scale and massing prevailing around the site; urban grain; sense of enclosure and where appropriate following existing building lines; rhythm of neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths; active, lively frontages to public realm; and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

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 proposal involves a roof extension consisting of a full-width dormer, and an extension over the closet wing that projects 6.3m beyond the dormer. Three roof lights are proposed to the front roof slope. The addition would be clad in grey slates and would feature grey uPVC windows.

The terrace falls within a part of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area, wherein roof extensions are an established form of development. Within Grasmere Road, a number of roof extensions have been granted permission in recent years; however, these are notably much smaller in scale and feature smaller conservation style roof lights. These include: 4 Grasmere Road (2024/0456), 2 Grasmere Road 2023/2567), 37 Grasmere Road (HGY/2021/0243), 44 Grasmere Road (HGY/2020/0983), 52 Grasmere Road (HGY/2020/2738), 64 Grasmere Road (HGY/2022/0975) and First Floor Flat, 25 Grasmere Road (HGY/2022/3908). Of these permissions, the largest addition extends 3.9m beyond the dormer.

The proposed roof extension would be significantly larger than others approved within this part of the conservation area, appearing overly dominant to the rear roof form and harming the established pattern of development. From a design perspective, the roof extension would cover the majority of the rear roof slopes retaining little of the original roof form and representing a disproportionate addition to the building. The use of uPVC windows on roof extensions within conservation areas is largely discouraged due to their prominence, and it is considered an unsympathetic material in this instance.

The proposed outrigger addition, by reason of its excessive length, scale and inconsistency with previous development, would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the terrace and would undermine the established pattern of development within the conservation area. The proposed front roof lights are not conservation-type, which would result in them appearing unnecessarily prominent and would detract from the street scene. This effect would be compounded by their size and the inconsistent dimensions of the openings.

Any harm to a heritage asset is undesirable in principle, especially when it erodes its special interest, value and significance. While the roof extension would not be overly visible in public views from Windermere Road due to existing vegetation, the permanence of this screening is not guaranteed. The rear elevation would be visible in private views and this impact must be taken into account when assessing harm to a conservation area. In this instance, the proposal would overly-dominate the rear roof slope and the rear elevation of the terrace, failing to appear subordinate to the host building, contrary to the design and heritage principles set out in Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 in the Council's Development Management Document 2017 and Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017 and Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021.

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 proposal would introduce a substantial roof addition that would add nearly a full storey to the existing building measuring 6m beyond the rear elevation and 2.4m tall. By reason of its height and

substantial length, the extension over the outrigger is therefore likely to have an overbearing effect to the nearest upper floor windows of the neighbouring building No. 7, causing material harm to residential amenity.

Conclusion

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its scale, siting, materials and design would form a discordant and dominant feature to the rear elevation, detracting from the appearance of this property as well as undermining a consistent form and rhythm associated with previous development within the terrace, thus harming the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 in the Council's Development Management Document 2017 and Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017 and Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its scale, siting, height and length, would appear overbearing and would be detrimental to the amenities of No. 7 Grasmere Road. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policies SP0 and SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and is inconsistent with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. 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 development is less than 100 square metres and would not create a whole new unit and as such is not liable for CIL.

6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

1. The proposed roof extension, by reason of its scale, siting, materials and design would form a discordant and dominant feature to the rear elevation, detracting from the appearance of this property as well as undermining a consistent form and rhythm associated with previous development within the terrace, thus harming the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 in the Council's Development Management Document 2017 and Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan 2017 and Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021.
2. The proposed roof extension, by reason of its scale, siting, height and length, would appear overbearing and would be detrimental to the amenities of No. 7 Grasmere Road. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policies SP0 and SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and is inconsistent with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework.