LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/0979 **Ward:** Highgate

Date received: 24/03/2016

Drawing number of plans: 14042/1, 2, 4 & 5

Address: 1 Cholmeley Park N6 5ET

Proposal: New roof structure, two new rear dormers, four velux type windows in front roof slope and alterations (Householder Application)

Applicant: Mrs A Minhas

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Valerie Okeiyi

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

2.1 This is an application for new roof structure, two new rear dormers, four velux type windows in front roof slope and alterations

Site and Surroundings

2.1.1 The site is located on the western side of Cholmeley Park in close proximity to Archway Road. The property is a two storey detached house rendered in white which includes a flat roofed extension to the site. The property lies in the Highgate Conservation Area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2015/0882 1 Cholmeley Park London - Replacement roof form with two rear dormers -Grant permission 14/08/2015

HGY/2014/2232 1 Cholmeley Park London - Loft conversion and alterations Refused

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Internal

1) LBH Conservation Officer
2) LBH Building Control

4.2 There were no internal comments received

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 46 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:2
Objecting:2
Supporting:0

5.1 Highgate Society made representation on the application, as summarised below;

- The size and bulk of the development is out of keeping with the well proportioned house in the conservation area
- Overdevelopment
- Contrary to conservation area policies
- The new roof extension is overbearing

5.2 Highgate CAAC made representation on the application, as summarised below;

- Concerns with the bulk and scale
- Impact on the streetscene
- The development breeches design guidelines for conservation areas
- Detrimental to the conservation area
- The new dormer should be subservient to the design of the existing roofscape

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. The impact of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
2. The impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

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. Emerging policy DM9 of the

Development Management, Development Plan Document (2015) continues this approach.

6.2 Saved UDP (2006) Policy CV5 requires alterations and extensions to preserve and maintain the character of conservation areas and also respect characteristic features such as doors, windows or materials of buildings. This should be considered alongside Chapter 12 of the NPPF, SPG2 'Conservation and archaeology'.

6.3 The proposal seeks to modify the existing roof form to a mansard design and extend it over the existing, two storey side extension. Three dormers are also proposed to the rear. This application is almost identical to the previous refusal under planning reference; HGY/2014/2232 for loft conversion and alterations. Officers consider the proposed mansard roof would substantially increase the bulk and massing of the roof creating an overbearing and incongruous feature within the conservation area. This would be particularly prevalent from the side of the property which is highly visible from the street. Therefore the proposal would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the conservation area, contrary to Saved Policy UD3 and CSV5 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011 and Draft DM Policy DM9 by reason of overall bulk and scale in relation to the property.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.4 The London Plan (2016) Policy 7.6 *Architecture* states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. UDP (2006) Saved Policy UD3 also requires development not to have a significant adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight, or sunlight, privacy overlooking, aspect noise, pollution and of fume and smell nuisance. Draft DM Policy (2015) DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' continues this approach and requires developments to ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for its users and neighbours.

6.5 There are no significant concerns with regards to amenity, as such the proposal is in accordance with London Plan Policy 7.6, Saved UDP Policy UD3 and Draft DM Policy DM1.

Conclusions

The proposal would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the area and neither preserve or enhance the conservation area contrary to Saved Policy UD3 and CSV5 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2011 and Draft DM Policy DM9 by reason of overall bulk and scale in relation to the property

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

N/A

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2016/0979

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 14042/1, 2, 4 & 5

For the following reason(s)

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, scale, size and massing, would be out of keeping with the design and character of the existing dwelling, and would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the property and the visual amenity of the area as a whole, and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policies CSV1 and UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Draft DM Policy DM9.