LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/0742 **Ward:** Crouch End

Date received: 11/03/2016

Drawing number of plans: Existing 2nd floor & roof plan, Existing rear elevation, Existing side elevation, Existing roof plan, Proposed 2nd floor plan, Proposed rear elevation, Proposed side elevation, Proposed roof plan & Photograph showing birds-eye view

Address: 39 Clifton Road N8 8JA

Proposal: Formation of loft conversion with rear dormer and enlargement of existing dormer (householder application)

Applicant: Mrs Jemma O'Neill

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Sarah Madondo

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) The proposed rear dormer by reason of its size, bulk and siting, with the associated alterations to the outrigger to this property would have an unbalancing effect on its appearance, harming the appearance of the building and group of buildings failing to preserve the character and appearance of this part of Crouch End conservation area, contrary to policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' and 7.8 'Heritage Assets' of the London Plan 2015, Policy SP11 'Design', SP12 'Conservation' of the Local Plan 2013, saved policy UD3 'General Principles' CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas' of the UDP (2013) and Draft DM Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design'

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the formation of a loft conversion with rear dormer and enlargement of existing dormer.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application property is located on the eastern side of Clifton Road. This section of the street is lined with a group of grand dwellings, Nos. 27 to 45 (odd). These three storey red brick properties with prominent canted bay windows and Tudor-

style gables contribute positively to the character and appearance of Crouch End Conservation Area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.3 Tree Preservation Orders CON/2006/0546 39 & 41 Clifton Road Hornsey London Yew x 3 0 crow reduce by up to 30% and thin remainder by 15%

Tree Preservation Orders CON/2007/0423 39 Clifton Road Hornsey London See Specification

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Ward Councillors
Neighbouring properties

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 18 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses:
Objecting:0
Supporting:0

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design and Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area

6.1 London Plan Policy 7.8 requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Haringey Local Plan Policy SP12 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets. Saved Haringey Unitary Development Plan Policy CSV5 requires that alterations or extensions preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. Draft DM policy DM1 requires that development proposals should respect their surroundings by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

6.2 The legal statutory test in respect of the protection of Conservation Areas (Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Listed Buildings Act 1990) is also of importance here. In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given "considerable importance and weight" in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.

6.3 The proposal is for a the formation of loft conversion with rear dormer and enlargement of existing dormer. The extension would unbalance the relationship between the subject property and the adjoining property. In would also depart from the uniformity found in this group of properties where the eaves, ridge and roof line of the outrigger are the same; thus disrupting the overall architectural composition of these properties failing to preserve the prevailing character and appearance of this part of the conservation area.

6.4 While there is a roof extension on the outrigger of No 43 this does not change the profile of the outrigger to the same extended as proposed here. Officers would also point out that each planning application must be considered on its individual merits and that as per recent case there is a need to apply considerable weight in the preservation of the setting of conservation areas. This is now a higher test in comparison to the interpretations derived from PPS5 and the tests in the NPPF 2012 (paragraphs 132-134). As such in this case as harm is caused to this part of the conservation area (which even if viewed as being 'less than substantial'), there are no compelling reasons to set aside the statutory test. As such the Local Planning Authority is not in a position to recommend this application for approval.

Impact on residential amenity

6.14 The London Plan 2011 Policy 7.6 Architecture states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. Saved Policy UD3 also requires development not to have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy and aspect.

6.15 The increased overlooking from the rear dormer would not be significant. It also needs to be borne in mind that properties and gardens in a suburban street of this his nature are already overlooked by multiple first floor windows.

Conclusions

6.4 The proposed rear dormer by reason of its size, bulk and siting, with the associated alterations to the outrigger to this property would have an unbalancing effect on its appearance, harming the appearance of the building and group of buildings failing to preserve the character and appearance of this part of Crouch End conservation area, contrary to policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' and 7.8 'Heritage Assets' of the London Plan 2015, Policy SP11 'Design', SP12 'Conservation' of the Local Plan 2013, saved policy UD3 'General Principles' CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas' of the UDP (2013) and Draft DM Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design'.

6.5 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

7. CIL APPLICABLE

7.1 The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2016/0742

Applicant's drawing No.(s) Existing 2nd floor & roof plan
Existing rear elevation
Existing side elevation
Existing roof plan
Proposed 2nd floor plan
Proposed rear elevation
Proposed side elevation
Proposed roof plan
Photograph showing birds-eye view

The proposed rear dormer by reason of its size, bulk and siting, with the associated alterations to the outrigger to this property would have an unbalancing effect on its appearance, harming the appearance of the building and group of buildings failing to preserve the character and appearance of this part of Crouch End conservation area, contrary to policies 7.4 'Local Character' and 7.6 'Architecture' and 7.8 'Heritage Assets' of the London Plan 2015, Policy SP11 'Design', SP12 'Conservation' of the Local Plan 2013, saved policy UD3 'General Principles' CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas' of the UDP (2013) and Draft DM Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design'