



FAO: Planning Department,
Haringey London Borough Council

Ref: HGY/2022/2697
Date: 28/11/2022

HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION ADVICE

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: 108-110 Colney Hatch Lane, N10 1EA.

Built Heritage Advice pertaining to an application for: Change of use to 2no.dwellings (Use Class C3), extension to create lower ground floor level (basement) and lightwells, rear and side roof and dormer extensions and alterations, single storey rear extension, replacement of single storey front extensions, new/altered/replacement windows and doors, new rooflights, alterations to cladding and rear terraces, landscaping works and provision of cycle stores.

The proposed development site (the Site) is located within Sub Area 7 (Colney Hatch Lane & Wellfield Avenue to The Avenue) of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area and is considered to make a neutral contribution to the streetscene and wider conservation area.

In statutory terms, the significance of the heritage asset is recognised by its designation as a conservation area, reflecting their 'special interest'. Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states:

When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

The Muswell Hill Conservation Area notes:

There is less consistency in the style and appearance of the properties in the roads to the north of Alexandra Park Road. However, they are generally two storeys in height and most have bays and gables on the front elevation. The properties at the northern end of Muswell Avenue, on Barnard Hill and the south side of Goodwyn's Vale are modest sized terraces. The properties along Colney Hatch Lane are slightly larger. The front elevations of many have been painted or rendered and about half of them have lost their original entrance doors and timber sash windows. As a result the quality of the street scene is not of the same consistency as that of others within the conservation area.



Conversely, the Site has retained much of its original and historic fabric including the timber sash windows.

The proposals to replace the single-storey extensions will restore a comprehension of symmetry to the principal elevation and is considered to enhance the character and appearance of the streetscene and wider conservation area. As such, there are no objections to the proposed replacement extensions subject to materiality and detailing which may be managed through the relevant planning conditions.

However, there are concerns regarding the proposed rooflights to the street-facing roof slope; rooflights are incongruous features within historic streetscapes and are not considered acceptable in conservation areas. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is a precedent for rooflights within the immediate environs of the Site, it is incumbent upon local planning authorities to ensure that negative or intrusive features within conservation areas do not become prevalent, thereby failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, contrary to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF. It is therefore considered that the introduction of rooflights to the street-facing roof slope would lead to low levels of less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, making Paragraph 202 of the NPPF relevant. Furthermore, no clear and convincing justification for that harm has been provided, contrary to Paragraph 200 of the NPPF.

Whilst there are no objections to the principle of the proposed development to the rear of the Site, the choice of metal cladding and its reflective quality will be key to its success; an overly burnished or detracting sheen should be resisted. This may be managed through the relevant planning condition.

There are concerns regarding the proposed extension of the existing side dormers. Whilst there are no objections to extending the length of the dormer eastwards, the proposed dormers should not be extended closer to the eaves as it is considered that this increase in massing would detract from the roofscape of the historic core of the Site.

In addition, the proposed new entrance doors with ornate porticos are considered to detract from the principal elevation and the original intended design of the historic building. It is recommended that the design of these entrances be amended to remain subservient to the front entranceways.

It is not possible to support the current iteration of the proposals as they are in conflict with paragraphs 200, 202, and 206 of the NPPF, and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

There may be potential to mitigate that harm through the omission of the rooflights to the street-facing roof slope, a reduction in size of the proposed side dormers, and redesigning the side entrances.

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Pace BA (Hons) MSc IHBC
Historic Environment Team
Place Services

Note: This letter is advisory and should only be considered as the opinion formed by specialist staff in relation to this particular matter