



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/25/3365381

8 Rosebery Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2LH

- 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 & Mrs Scott & Caroline McFarlane against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Reference is HGY/2024/1606.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion including side and rear dormer extension, and front facing roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Appellants ask that I review both 'original' (REV0) and 'revised' (REVA) drawings. However, my only remit is to consider the formal decision of the Council and the plans that applied thereto; given the determination was made against the REVA plans this is the scheme which I shall assess. The above description applies to the REVA plans.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property is an attractively proportioned and detailed two storey mid-terrace dwelling. It is in a distinctive row which, because of insteps, has the appearance of semi-detached dwellings. The properties have hipped roof ends. The Edwardian residential street scene has houses of architectural and aesthetic merit that collectively contribute to a well-established local character and a most attractive townscape. The proposal is as described above.
 5. The site lies within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. There is a duty imposed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requiring decision makers to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. Policy HC1 of the London Plan (LP), Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 (HLP) and Policy DM9 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan 2017 (DP) enlarge and reflect this. LP Policy D3, HLP Policy SP11 and DP Policies DM1 and
-

DM12 are also all relevant to the case. Taken together and amongst other matters they seek to secure development which would display good quality design, complement the period and form of the original building, reflect local distinctiveness, and protect or enhance context and character.

6. I am in no doubt that hipped roof ends are a key defining feature along this stretch of terrace homes. To my mind it is a strong visual attribute and should be protected. Unfortunately, the planned side dormer would markedly interfere with the consistency and rhythm of the roofs and would diminish the prominence of the chimneys alongside. I note that the Appellants describe the dormer as subordinate, but I am not convinced that this adjective would reasonably apply to a dormer of the size, type and position embodied in the appeal proposal.
7. Furthermore, the rear dormer would appear as too large a box-like form reaching too closely to edges of the roof. It would lack any semblance of sympathetic design, bear little relation or proportionality to what lies below and when combined with the planned side dormer would lead to a jumbled and unattractively awkward arrangement at this upper level. Notwithstanding that the rear dormer would not be open to wide public vantage points it is particularly important to secure good design in a Conservation Area context such as this.
8. In summary, the roof changes would be excessive and cumbersome and would lack suitable subtlety in relation to this house and the character of the location; there would be adverse impingement upon the aesthetic qualities of this home and the wider area.
9. Given the foregoing I conclude that the change proposed would be contrary to the aims of Section 72(1) and would conflict with the development plan policies which I cite in paragraph 5 above. The appeal scheme would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host property or the wider area.

Other matters

10. I do understand the Appellants' wish for additional accommodation. I would agree that the scheme would not detract from residential amenity for neighbours. I appreciate that attempts have been made to seek to overcome the Council's concerns and that thought has been given in the selection of materials. In accord with the Council, I would not have issues with roof lights in isolation.
11. An appreciable number of alterations to dwellings have been drawn to my attention. However, they are different in nature to the scheme before me given form, location and scale and I would not hold all these as extensions which should set a design benchmark for this part of the Conservation Area. The specific Nos 1 and 12 Rosebury Garden examples have very different starting points given end-of-terrace positions and the latter's alterations are more modest. In any event I must assess this case on its own merits and my reasoning is set out above.
12. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellants but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.

13. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) have been considered. Key objectives of the Framework are to protect and enhance the qualities of the built environment as well as to safeguard heritage assets; development plan policies which I cite mirror these. The Framework underlines that great weight should be given to a heritage asset's conservation. The appeal proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset however what public benefits there would be would not outweigh this harm. Furthermore, there are no other benefits, including to the Appellants, which to my mind would be of a scale to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area which I have identified.

Overall conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character and appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR