

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0644
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	11 Perth Road, Hornsey, London, N4 3HB
Proposal:	Construction of roof extension with the erection of a rear dormer and insertion of 2no. front conservation style rooflights.
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	08/03/2024
Applicant:	4 Wright
Agent:	- Savage

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a three storey mid-terraced dwellinghouse on the southeast side of Perth Road. The site falls within a Stroud Green conservation area. It does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for construction of roof extension with the erection of a rear dormer and insertion of 2no. front conservation style rooflights.

Revised drawings were received to increase the width on the side adjacent to No.13, to incorporate the staircase into the dormer.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/2023/3173 – Loft conversion with a rear dormer extension inc. a Juliet balcony and insertion of 2no. front rooflights. Refused permission 22/1/2024.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

- LBH Conservation Officer: This part of the Stroud Green CA is less altered and wholly overwhelmingly these roof slopes on the terrace, block and surrounding streets are intact. The consistency of the form of the buildings is an important contributor to the significance of the Conservation Area. The Stroud Green Conservation Area's significance derives from its illustration of the evolution of a speculative late-Victorian residential development based on terraced housing. The development used a repetitive formula of house plans and elevations within limited variations. Interest was added by means of increasingly mass-produced architectural features available from builders' merchants such as window lintels, door casings, mouldings, capitals and roof details. The interest derived from areas architectural form is the consistency of the form(s) of the buildings which are a set of limited variations, and the different applied architectural features used to create visual interest and distinctions in the

scheme. The loss of the original, and consistent buildings form would diminish the appreciation that these buildings which were designed to have the same built form repeated in a terrace, across different streets, with the main variations to the front of the buildings to create attractive streets, whilst the rear elevations remained consistent and generally unadorned. This would accordingly cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, an alteration to the roof at this location and terrace is not supported.

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 0

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & appearance

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 proposed roof extension would be to the rear of the property. It would be 4.68m wide and be 2.84m deep. The overall height of the proposed roof addition would be 1.48m, the same height as the roof ridge.

It would be finished in materials that match those of the existing dwelling. The roof extension would accommodate 1no. of bedroom with ensuite within the subject building. It is observed that neighbouring properties, such as No.10, have similar roof extensions. However, this property lies on the opposite terrace.

Since the previously refused application under HGY/2023/3173, the size of the dormer has been reduced in terms of the depth and width, whereby the dormer and has been further setback from the eaves and set in from the flank walls. During this application revised drawings were received that extended the width of the dormer towards the side next to no.13 to incorporate the staircase.

The Council's Conservation Team has been consulted and their advice is outline above. The site, neighbouring terraces, and the terraces on neighbouring roads have predominantly not undergone roof extensions. The main roofs tend to have ridges that are not significantly high, which would affect the internal floor-to-ceiling height. Dormers have to be reasonably sized to ensure that the internal space is habitable, which is why the applicant extended the width closer to No.13 to ensure that the staircase is accommodated. However, this site is in a conservation area where there is a specific original and consistent character and appearance that needs to be preserved, which includes the appearance of the main roof, so the addition of a dormer would break this consistency and diminish the originality. Regardless, the principle of a dormer on this terrace where the existing roofline is unaltered and interrupted is considered unacceptable on conservation grounds.

Whilst it may be possible to view the proposal from Nos.11 and 13, the view would be dominant to the rear and alter the appearance of the roofline as a whole. Therefore, the local character and visual amenity of the Stroud Green conservation area would be adversely impacted.

The proposed development lies in an area of sensitive and special character worthy of retention within a Conservation Area. The proposed development, if approved, would detract from the historic character and appearance of the Stroud Green Conservation Area to the detriment of the vicinity contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy 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.

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 scale and massing of the proposed roof dormer extension is considered excessive for the size of the roof but would not result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight, or have an overbearing appearance to the neighbouring properties. There would not be material loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. The proposal is acceptable in amenity terms.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed development is not in accordance with Policies DM1, DM9 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 and impact on the site and would result in material harm to the surrounding conservation area. 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

The application is recommended for refusal subject to the following conditions.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed dormer would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area by reason of poor design in terms of asymmetry as well as its awkward siting and scale, contrary to DPD Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12, and London Plan Policy HC1.

The proposed dormer lies within a largely unaltered and uninterrupted roofline within a terrace. As such, the proposed dormer, would harm the character and appearance of the Stroud Green Conservation Area contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.