LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/1986 **Ward:** Muswell Hill

Date received: 16/06/2016

Last amended date: DD/MM/YYYY

Drawing number of plans: 1507-01, 1507-11 & 1507-12

Address: 1 Rookfield Avenue N10 3TS

Proposal: Formation of dormer window to rear roof to facilitate loft conversion (householder application)

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ian Rosenthal

Ownership: Private

Officer contact: Sarah Madondo

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the formation of a dormer window to the rear roof slope to facilitate a loft conversion.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The site is two storey end of terrace house located on Rookfield Avenue. No 1 is the first property on the northern side of this road close to the junction with Muswell Hill. The property forms part of a short terrace of 4 houses with the terrace being symmetrical in appearance. To the side of the plot is a narrow access path leading between Rookfield Avenue and Cascade Avenue.

3.3 The site is located in Rookfield Estate Conservation Area which is a designated conservation area/ heritage asset. The majority of the estate, including the application site, is controlled by an Article 4 Direction introduced in 1978.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.4 HGY/2004/1267 – Erection of single storey side and rear extension – Refused 21/07/2004

HGY/2006/1498 - Erection of single storey rear infil extension – Approved 06/09/2006

HGY/2015/2023 - Formation of dormer to rear roof and insertion of rooflights to rear and side roofslopes to facilitate loft conversion (householder application) – Withdrawn 05/11/2015

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Residents Association
Rookfield Estate Residents Association

4.2 The following responses were received:

Internal:

LBH Conservation Officer:

"In my opinion, the dormer is considered to be big and would cause harm, albeit less than substantial. The conservation area's significance lies in its homogeneity and consistent roof form and it is this part of the significance that would be affected most with the proposal. As per statutory duty and current policy framework, I have given great regard to the harm in assessing whether the development would preserve or enhance the conservation area. In this instance, the less than substantial harm has not been outweighed by any heritage or public benefit other than providing additional accommodation to the current occupier, and as such would not be acceptable.

The original guidance on the Rookfield Estate allows small dormers to be permissible if designed to a high standard. This was published in the 1980s, and whilst still valid should be seen in light on recent case laws such as Forge Field and Barnwell Manor and the NPPF. I also note that more recent dormers may have been allowed in the vicinity. These set a poor precedence and I am of the view that these cumulatively will have a significant impact on the homogeneity of the roof form of the estate and would cause substantial harm to the conservation area. As such, I am unable to support this scheme." (Submitted in respect of previous application HGY/2015/2023)

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application was publicised by way of site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 25 letters. No representations were received in respect of consultation.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;

2. Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Design and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

6.2 Under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 special attention is required to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), anticipates, amongst other things, that great weight is given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.

6.3 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 UDP (2013) Policy CV5 requires alterations and extensions to preserve and maintain the character of conservation areas. Emerging policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (2015) continues this approach.

6.4 As pointed out the site is located in Rookfield Estate Conservation Area. The estate is laid out on garden suburb principles with irregular groups of terrace houses and some semi's with generous areas of communal open spaces. The estate as built at the start of the 20th century retains a very high degree of visual cohesion with its conservation area significance deriving its homogeneity and its largely unaltered character. The original roof-scape to houses and terraces within the estate are also an important feature to the character of the estate. While there are examples of dormers to properties within the estate, generally most houses do not have roof alterations/ extensions.

6.5 The proposal is for the formation of a dormer window to the rear roof slope of this property to provide an additional bedroom and an ensuite. The dormer would be 2m in width and would have timber sash window with zinc cheeks. The dormer is positioned to align with the window openings below. An additional conservation style rooflight is to be installed to provide light and ventilation to the bathroom.

6.6 While in isolation the design and materials proposed for the dormer are considered to be acceptable, given however the location of the property in question and the special heritage value of the estate, the introduction of a dormer here would affect the character of the area. In specific the proposal would interrupt the roof-scape of the property and terrace in question, visually a strong feature to the special character and setting of this estate. The dormer would be visible from public vantage points, namely the pathway which runs along the side of this property and from private views within gardens backing on this site.

6.7 While it is noted that planning permission was granted for a rear dormer to No 3, Officers would however point out that each planning application must be considered on its individual merits. Officers would also point out that as per recent case law (namely Forge Field and Barnwell Manor) decision makers must 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 national planning policy and guidance. As such in this case as harm is caused to this part of the conservation area (which even though is less than substantial), there are no compelling reasons to set aside this statutory test.

6.8 Furthermore it is important to point out that although other dormers have been developed in the past, these were often in less prominent locations.

6.9 While it is also noted that Rookfield Estate Conservation Area Design Guide (published in 1981) did allow for certain sized and designed dormers, it is necessary to point out that since 1981 the 1990 Act and the 2012 Framework have both been published, both giving greater weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets. Officers therefore view that limited weight can be given to this Design Guide.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

6.10 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 (2013) 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 neighbours.

6.11 It is considered that the degree of overlooking created by the dormer extension would not be significant and as such the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers would not be affected.

Conclusions

6.13 To conclude the proposal here would neither preserve nor enhance the special character and appearance of this conservation area, and as such the proposal is viewed to be contrary to policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2015), policy SP12 of the Haringey's Local Plan (2015), saved policy CSV5 as well as draft policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (2016) which in combination seek to ensure the conservation of Haringey's heritage assets and their setting

6.14 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/2016/1986

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 1507-01, 1507-11 & 1507-12

The introduction of a dormer here would interrupt the roofscape of the property and terrace in question, visually a strong feature to the special character and setting of this estate overall failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to policy 7.8 of the London Plan (2015), policy SP12 of the Haringey's Local Plan (2015), saved UDP policy CSV5 and draft policy DM9 of the Development Management, DPD (2016).