



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 January 2025

by A Veevers BA(Hons) PGDip(BCon) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/24/3349651

45 Woodside Avenue, Hornsey, Haringey, London N10 3HY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Martin Matthews against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/1492.
 - The development proposed is described as 'roof extensions to facilitate loft conversion'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for loft conversion with a rear dormer extension and new gable roof form with four front rooflights at 45 Woodside Avenue, Hornsey, London N10 3HY in accordance with the terms of application Ref HGY/2024/1492 and the plans submitted with it, 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:
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH1 (Location Plan);
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH2 (Existing and Proposed Floor Plans);
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH3 (Existing and Proposed Floor Plans);
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH4 (Existing and Proposed Floor Plans);
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH5 (Existing and Proposed Roof Plans);
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH6 (Existing and Proposed Elevations);
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH7 (Existing and Proposed Elevations);
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH8 (Existing and Proposed Elevations) and
 - Drawing No 2405MM_HH1:SH9 (Existing and Proposed Section).
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials indicated on the application form.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development as stated on the application form is set out in the banner heading above. The Council on its decision notice, has described the development as 'loft conversion with a rear dormer extension and new gable roof form with four front rooflights'. This more accurately describes the proposals as shown on the plans and was used by the appellant in the appeal submission. I have considered the appeal on this basis and used the revised description in my formal decision above.

3. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was updated in December 2024. The content of the Framework has not been significantly altered insofar as it relates to this appeal, other than paragraph numbering. Therefore, it has not been necessary to seek further views from the main parties in this instance and I am satisfied no party would be prejudiced by determining the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a two storey detached dwelling located in a predominantly residential area. Dwellings in the area are largely designed with hipped roofs with occasional variety in roof form along Woodside Avenue and Fordington Road where hip to gable and/or side dormers have been added.
6. It was evident at my site visit that the appeal property is part of a group of six detached dwellings which, when originally constructed, were built to essentially the same design and are staggered in their frontage to Woodside Avenue, behind a short front garden and low brick wall. The predominant common feature of these properties is the projecting two storey curved bay beneath a gabled roof form with tile-hung pediment. This feature provides a consistent rhythm within the street scene.
7. However, there is more varied character to other aspects of these dwellings, with alterations including porches, garages and other side additions. At roof level 51 Woodside Avenue (No 51) incorporates a gabled roof form facing the side garden, No 43 includes large side dormers to each side roof plane and No 41 has two hip-to-gable roof alterations. Furthermore, a pair of large semi-detached properties across the road from the appeal property are of gabled roof form.
8. The appeal proposal seeks to convert the current hipped roof of the house to gable ends and to add a large dormer to the rear roof plane. It is also proposed to insert four rooflights into the front roof slope.
9. In views along Woodside Avenue and from the junction with Fordington Road and Lanchester Road, the proposal would be seen in the context of the gabled and side dormer roof forms of neighbouring No 43 and No 41. Due to the small gap and staggered alignment between adjacent properties, along with the set back of that part of the roof to be altered and the consistency of external materials, the proposed hip-to-gable would have minimal visual impact when seen from other properties or the public domain. I observed other hip-to-gable roof extensions in the area have been successfully integrated without materially harming the street scene. Given the above context, the proposed roof alteration would not appear incongruous. Moreover, the projecting bay feature would remain the predominant feature of the property and the row within which it sits.
10. Whilst the proposed rear dormer would be large and the external materials would be modern, it would be lower in height than the main roof and set in slightly from the side and eaves of the roof. It would appear very similar in size, design and materials to the rear dormer at No 41. Although the overall massing of the dwelling

would be increased, it would not be to unacceptable levels since both the hip-to-gable extension and rear dormer would be constructed within the original plan depth of the dwelling. Overall, the proposal would relate well to the host building with regard to form, scale and massing.

11. The Council's Officer Report confirms that there would be no concerns in relation to the proposed four rooflights on the front roof slope in the event I find the hip-to-gable alteration to be acceptable. On the basis of the evidence before me and observations at my site visit, I agree.
12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the area. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2013) (HLP) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017). Together these policies require that development must achieve high-quality design that respects local context and character.
13. In the decision notice, the Council also refers to Policy SP12 of the HLP. This policy relates to the conservation of heritage assets. From the evidence before me, the appeal site is not affected by any non-designated or designated heritage asset. Therefore, I do not consider this policy determinative in my consideration of this appeal.

Conditions

14. The Council has indicated the conditions it considers necessary in their Appeal Questionnaire which I have considered against the tests of paragraph 57 of the Framework and advice provided in Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary to impose a condition to identify the approved plans in the interest of precision. A condition in respect of materials is necessary in the interest of character and appearance. I have undertaken some minor editing in respect of this condition in the interests of clarity since the proposed external materials for the dormer would not match the existing dwelling.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted.

A Veevers

INSPECTOR