



FAO: Planning Department,
Haringey London Borough Council

Ref: HGY/2022/4051
Date: 05/01/2023

HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION ADVICE

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: 42, Midhurst Avenue, Hornsey, London, N10 3EN.

Built Heritage Advice pertaining to an application for: New boundary fence and front passage enclosure for bicycle storage.

The proposed development site (the Site) is located in Sub Area 4 (Midhurst Avenue to Hillfield Park) of the Muswell Hill 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.

This is an area of two-storey residential development that was developed in the first decade of the twentieth century. The architectural style, scale, appearance and detailed treatment of the properties are consistent with much of the adjacent residential area. The quality of the streetscape and the frontages is also similar to the adjoining area.

The Site forms part of a homogeneous terrace of houses arranged in pairs set between consistent recesses which makes an attractive and positive contribution to the streetscene and wider conservation area. All of the properties within the street are identified as positive contributors.

There are no objections to the proposed front gate and low-level boundary fence.

However, the extent of the proposed enclosure would detrimentally compromise the legibility of the existing recess and interrupt the symmetry of the terrace, failing to preserve the character and appearance of the streetscene and wider conservation area, contrary to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF. As such, the proposals are considered to constitute a scheme which would lead to less than



substantial harm to the 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.

In addition, the introduction of a non-traditional material (polycarbonate) is also considered to have an adverse impact on the heritage asset.

This harm may potentially be mitigated by reducing the scale of the proposed enclosure; there is the potential for a sympathetic and appropriately designed enclosure which respects the significance of the consistent design of the terrace. Reducing the depth of the enclosure to c.2.3m (set back from the building line of the host dwelling) and the height to c.1.3m would allow for the recess to remain a prominent and visually dominant feature, ensuring that the homogeneity of the streetscene is uncompromised. Additionally, a timber roof would mitigate the harm resulting from the proposed polycarbonate roof.

It is not possible to support the current iteration of the proposals as they are in conflict with Paragraphs 1997c, 199, 200, 202, and 206 of the NPPF and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

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