



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 29 July 2021

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th August 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/21/3270128

1 Rosebery Road, Hornsey, London N10 2LE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Pelosi against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/2703, dated 21 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as a hip to gable conversion and rear roof extension to create habitable space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for hip to gable conversion and rear roof extension to create habitable space at 1 Rosebery Road, Hornsey, London N10 2LE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2020/2703, dated 21 October 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans; Proposed Ground and First Floor Plans, Drawing Number P1-100; Proposed Loft and Roof Plans, Drawing Number P1-101; Sections, Drawing Number P2-100; Proposed Front and Rear Elevations, Drawing Number P3-100; Proposed North Elevation, Drawing Number P3-101.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Notwithstanding the approved plans, the development hereby approved shall retain and incorporate all existing architectural detailing of the side (north) elevation below the existing gutter line and including the existing chimney and its detailing.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the original decision The London Plan 2021 has been published by the Mayor of London. It comprises the spatial development strategy for London and is now part of the development plan. The policies contained in The London Plan 2021 replace those of The London Plan 2016 referred to in the Council's original decision.

3. The Council were given the opportunity to comment on which policies of the new London Plan, as relevant to the appeal, replace those on the Decision Notice, however no response was received. I have therefore determined the appeal based on the Local Plan policies referred to in the Decision Notice, and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
4. On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised Framework. It replaces the previous version published in February 2019. The Framework represents the Government's up-to-date planning policies for England and how they should be applied.
5. The circumstances of this appeal are such that it has not been necessary to seek comments from the parties on the revised Framework.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area (MHCA).

Reasons

7. The appeal property is a two-storey end of terrace dwelling. It is situated on Rosebery Road which is a long terrace of residential properties. The site is located within the MHCA that is notable as forming an essentially Edwardian suburb that developed around a once rural village settlement on high ground on one of the main routes into and out of London.
8. The street on which the appeal property is located is notable for its length and uniformity of high-quality housing. The side elevation of the appeal property is highly visible when accessing Rosebery Road from the busier Alexandra Park Road. This elevation includes a number of detailed architectural features and brick detailing. Although not clear from the submitted plans, the appellant has outlined that these would be retained and incorporated into the proposed development. The side elevation includes a hipped roof. Such a feature is not a particularly key or notable feature of the area, with several end properties incorporating pitched roofs on the gable elevation.
9. The proposed development would replace the hipped roof with a gable and includes a proposed roof extension. For the reasons given above, I do not consider that the principle of changing the hipped roof to a gable to be fundamentally unacceptable, providing that materials which match the existing building, and the architectural detailing is retained and incorporated, both of which can be secured by an appropriately worded planning condition.
10. Although the alteration would create a greater scale on the side elevation, it would not exceed the height of the existing dwelling nor would it appear overly dominant. It would be consistent with the design approach of the host property and that prevalent in the surrounding built environment, and thus not be out of character.
11. From the rear, the roof extension would be less visible in the wider street-scene, where the trees in the rear garden obscure views from Rosebery Mews. The existing rear section of the dwelling has a convoluted relationship with the remainder of the property and the adjoining property. It is not as significant as the principal front or exposed side elevation. Although the proposed

development would increase the volume, bulk and visibility of this part of the property, it would remain subservient to the remainder of the property and not cause harm overall.

12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm, and thereby preserve, the character and appearance of the MHCA. It would comply with Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan – Strategic Policies (2013) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Local Plan – Development Management DPD (2017) which require, amongst other things, that development is of a high standard of design, including for residential extensions, and shall conserve the historic significance of heritage assets.
13. The proposal would also comply with the Framework which requires, amongst other things, that development is of high-quality design, sympathetic to local character whilst sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets.
14. In reaching my findings, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the MHCA in accordance with Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of certainty.
16. It is necessary to impose planning conditions requiring the use of matching materials and the retention and incorporation of architectural detailing as outlined. The reason for these conditions is in the interests of the character and appearance of the MHCA.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons outlined above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR