



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2024

by C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/23/3325589

86 Grosvenor Road, Hornsey, Haringey, London N10 2DS

- 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 Ms Jessica Olive against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2022/4466.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer together with side hip-to-gable and Velux windows to the front roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in December 2023. As the changes do not materially affect the main issues in this case, the parties have not been invited to make further comments.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Vallance Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The Vallance Road Conservation Area (CA) comprises primarily of dense residential development between Alexandra Palace and the southern edge of Muswell Hill Golf Club. The significance of the CA is derived partly from the large and finely detailed properties, that are well-preserved examples of high quality architecture including Arts and Crafts inspired houses dating from the 1920s. The appeal property is part of a group of several properties on Grosvenor Road that run from No.34 to No.90 (the group) that are of an attractive Neo Georgian design. Properties in the group are mainly semi-detached or asymmetrical terraces of three properties, that comprise of a mirrored pair and a third property featuring a turreted bay.
5. Except for some replacement windows and rooflights, the front elevations of most of the properties within the group are relatively unaltered and retain their original hipped roof form. To the rear, several properties have been extended from the roof and have large 'box' dormers.
6. 86 Grosvenor Road (No.86) is two storey and located on the end of a terrace of three, its attractive design includes a full height turreted bay. The property retains the original hipped roof and, apart from a roof light on the rear

elevation, is unaltered. The proposal is for alterations to allow for conversion of the attic space, including a hip to gable extension, the erection of a 'box' dormer on the rear roof plane and installation of rooflights on the front elevation.

7. The Council's concerns are centred on the hip-to-gable roof extension. Therefore, my assessment of the appeal is focused on this element of the proposal.
8. There are two properties that have had hip-to-gable roof extensions as part of the group, 76 Grosvenor Road (No.76) and 80 Grosvenor Road (No.80), which are located on either end of a terrace of three. Based on the evidence before me the roof extension on No.80 has never benefitted from planning permission and the roof extension on No.76 was granted as it would balance the terrace. The hip-to-gable extensions on No.76 and No.80 are outliers and disrupt the consistent pattern of hipped roofs evident in the remaining group. They therefore result in an incongruous form of development when viewed from the street. Given their history and their impact on the character and appearance of the group they do not establish a precedent for other hip-to-gable extensions.
9. I note that the appellant has retained the original windows of the property and the proposed development would utilise traditional materials to reflect existing. However, the extension of the roof would result in the loss of both the original hipped roof form and the balance of the terrace as a whole. Further, the prominence of the turret on the front elevation is emphasised by its alignment with the existing hipped roof. While it is acknowledged that the proposed design would maintain the ridge of the turret itself, the erection of the proposed roof extension would result in the loss of this alignment and architectural detail.
10. The development would result in the erosion of an example of high quality architecture within the CA and as such would harm the character, appearance and significance of the CA as a whole. Paragraph 208 of the Framework explains that where, as I find in this case, the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits. The proposed development would provide improved living conditions for the appellant, there may also be economic benefits associated with construction. However, any specific public benefits there may be in this case, would be insufficient to outweigh the great weight I must attach to the harm I have identified to the designated heritage asset.
11. For the reasons detailed above the character or appearance of the Vallance Road CA would not be preserved or enhanced as a result of the proposed development. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 2013 (CS) and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017 (DPD). These policies are consistent with the Framework in requiring new development to be of the highest standard of design that respects and conserves its local context, character and historic significance.

Other Matters

12. I note that the appellant is aggrieved with the Council's handling of their application. However, this is a matter between the parties that does not fall

within the remit of this appeal. I have therefore given it no weight in my determination.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR