

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/2672
Type	Full planning permission
Location	75, Hillfield Park, London, N10 3QU
Proposal	Construction of mansard roof extension to garage to create first floor accommodation.
Case Officer	James Mead
Valid Date	28/09/2022
Applicant	Mr Mark Shaw
Agent	Mr Justin Brown

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

2.1 This is an application for the construction of a mansard roof extension to an existing single storey garage. This roof extension would enable the creation of first floor accommodation.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site is occupied by a two storey, end of terrace dwellinghouse, which incorporates a single storey attached garage. This property sits in a sloping plot, where the land levels drop away to the east. The dwelling is located on the eastern side of Hillfield Park, however fronts onto St James's Lane. Neighbouring directly to the east of the site there appears to be a yard area utilised by a commercial use. Beyond this is a locally listed bridge and there are several businesses that operate from the space beneath the bridge. The bridge forms part of Parkland Walk, which is of ecological value, being designated as a Local Nature Reserve (LNR) and Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC). To the west of the site the setting is residential in character and is predominantly made up of terraced properties. The site is situated within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area (CA) and the appraisal covering this area identifies the row of properties on the eastern side of Hillfield Park (39 – 75 Hillfield Park) as buildings which contribute positively to the character of the CA. This appraisal specifically refers to No.75 commenting on its attractive flank elevation that is of yellow stock brick with red brick dressings.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

2.3 The most recent planning history relating to the site is as follows:

- HGY/2015/1537: Reinstatement of garage building consisting of single story structure with flat roof and parapet wall. Granted.
- HGY/2006/1793: Replacement of existing rear conservatory extension with single storey rear conservatory extension. Granted.

3. Consultation response

3.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

1) *LBH Conservation Officer:* The proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The success of the existing garage is that it is subservient and not visually prominent within the street scene or Conservation Area. The roof extension would result in a visually prominent, incongruous and dominant feature within the Conservation Area, failing to preserve its character and appearance. The proposed addition of windows would exacerbate the prominence of the proposed extension and undermine the legible subservience of the existing garage. There are in principle concerns.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of site notice and 11 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: 0

Objecting: 0

Supporting: 0

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Design, Appearance & Heritage;
2. Neighbour Amenity;
3. Ecology;
4. Other Considerations.

Design, Appearance & Heritage

6.2 London Plan Policy D3 requires all development to make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites. This policy also notes that schemes should enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance, and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types forms and proportions. Local Plan Policy SP11 and DPD Policy DM1 require all new development to achieve the highest standard of design that respects local context, character and historic significance. Proposals should relate positively to their locality having regard to: building heights, form, scale, massing, urban grain, building lines and plot/building widths, in accordance with DPD

Policy DM1. Extensions should respect or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of original buildings, in line with DPD Policy DM12.

6.3 London Plan Policy HC1, Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 require proposals to conserve, preserve and enhance the historic significance and settings of CAs. Alterations and extensions to buildings within a CA should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive.

6.4 The existing garage is of notable width and sits forward of the main building line of No.75. Therefore, this structure is highly visible in views along St James's Lane. However, the low height of the existing garage limits the dominance of this building within the street scene.

6.5 This scheme seeks to provide first floor accommodation through a roof extension above the existing garage. The roof extension would project forward of the main front wall of No.75 and would be of substantial width, spanning across the full southern flank of the existing garage. Noting these observations, and given the height increase, it is considered that the prominence of the garage within the locality would be harmfully elevated. The resultant garage would appear overly dominant in the street scene, would appear excessively bulky and would draw visual attention away from the architectural quality of No.75. The scale of the enlargement would also block street scene views of No.75, particularly those taken from vantage points to the east on St James's Lane. The loss of views of this attractive host building would detract from the appearance of both the CA and the St James's Lane street scene.

6.6 The roof extension would be of mansard type, with dormers inserted on the north and south roof slopes. It is acknowledged that there is a mixture of pitched, hipped and flat roof forms evident in this wider street scene. However, mansard roof designs are not a predominant roof form seen in this locality. Acknowledging this, it is considered that the proposed mansard roof would appear alien and incongruous within this setting. It is also considered that this proposed roof design would be of inappropriate massing and proportions, when compared with other roof forms in the locality.

6.7 Overall, the proposed roof extension would appear unduly bulky, overly dominant, visually incongruous and unsympathetically proportioned. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host property, the street scene and the CA. The special interest and historic significance of the CA would not be preserved.

Neighbour Amenity

6.8 London Plan Policy D6 outlines that the design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific it is stated that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight that is appropriate for the context, while also minimising overshadowing. Furthermore, DPD Policy DM1 states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects to adjacent buildings and land. Schemes should also avoid overlooking and loss of privacy that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

6.9 The proposed roof extension would be set-away from the boundary with 73 Hillfield Park (attached property to the north). Due to this, it is not considered that this neighbouring property would be materially affected by: overbearing impacts, loss of light, overshadowing or undue harm to outlook. The new northern facing upper floor window added to the garage could allow views towards the gardens and some openings of neighbouring properties to the north. However, if this application were to be approved, a condition could be attached requiring the fitting of obscured glazing in this new window. This would ensure that a harmful invasion of privacy would not result. The amenity and living conditions of neighbouring properties would not be unduly harmed. The nature of the roof extension means that it would not affect the operation of commercial premises to the east of the site.

Ecology

6.10 SINC and LNRs should be protected and enhanced, in accordance with London Plan Policy G6, Local Plan Policy SP13 and DPD Policy DM19. While the proposal would be adjacent to the Parkland Walk LNR and SINC, it would not impact any features or assets of nature conservation.

Other Considerations

6.11 A previous section of this report has noted that the proposed scheme would detract from the character and historic significance of the Muswell Hill CA. However, the localised nature of the impacts means that for the purposes of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) the harm would be 'less than substantial'. Paragraph 202 of the NPPF notes that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. No tangible public benefits would arise from this scheme, and therefore the harm to the character, appearance, historic significance and special interest of the Muswell Hill CA would not be outweighed.

Conclusion

6.12 The proposal is considered unacceptable, as there would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the CA. The historic significance of the CA would be harmed, with the special interest of this heritage asset not preserved.

6.13 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.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed roof extension, by virtue of its inappropriate size, scale, massing, form and design, would appear as a bulky, dominant, unsympathetically proportioned and incongruous addition. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host building, the site, the street scene and the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. The special interest and historic significance of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D3 & HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 & SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1, DM9 & DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017).