

Dear Sir / Madam,

**APPEAL TO THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE FOLLOWING THE DECISION TO REFUSE
PERMISSION OF HOUSEHOLDER APPLICATION (HGY/2022/2672) BY LONDON BOROUGH OF
HARINGEY.**

75 Hillfield Park, London, N10 3QU

On behalf of the applicant Mr Mark Shaw, we native north architects (agent), seek to overturn the decision to refuse permission for the 'Construction of a mansard roof extension to garage to create first floor accommodation' with representations as outlined below:

Reason for Refusal (refer to decision notice)

- 1. 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).*

The refusal was issued with an Officers Report from Case Officer Mr James Mead. The contents of this are occasionally referenced in our representations below.

It is worth noting that no local representations were received as a result of consultation. The site is in a Conservation Area, but is not nationally or locally Listed. The following consultation response was provided from the London Borough of Haringey Conservation Officer;

- 1. 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.*

In the interest of keeping representations concise, the below response will focus on the following matters which we understand to be the key reasons for refusal;

1. Size, scale, massing
2. Form
3. Design
4. Impact on the host building, street scene and Conservation Area including character and appearance
5. Windows

1. Size, scale and massing

The proposed mansard is 11m wide and 3.7m deep set within the existing garage footprint. Given the nature of the sloping site, the garage is currently read as a lower ground floor level and as a result, the mansard floor level could be considered an upper ground, or lower first floor level. When viewed from St James' Lane looking East, the street is notably elevated which mitigates the appearance of height. This view would only obscure vegetation and adhoc brick infill to the commercial premises. When viewed from St James' Lane looking West, the arched bridge largely conceals views on approach the mansard would be set in front of the blank rear elevation which makes little contribution. It should also be noted that the Conservation Area boundary does not begin until after the commercial premises on the West side of the bridge.

The proposed mansard is 2.36m high when measured from the top of the garage parapet. This has been carefully considered and an internal floor to ceiling height of approximately 2.39m sought. Give technical housing design standards would typically target 2.5m floor to ceiling height, this demonstrates design measures to mitigate any impact to height.

Of building height, DM6 of the Development Management DPD (2017) notes;

1. *For all development proposals, the Council expects building heights to be of an appropriate scale which respond positively to the site's surroundings, the local context, and the need to achieve a high standard of design in accordance with Policy DM1.*

Development reaching heights of up to two storeys is commonplace in the surrounding context. It should be noted that two storey additions or 'outriggers' to the rear of Victorian terraced properties are common features, and numerous examples are present in the immediate context. No. 50 Hillfield Park (opposite) features first floor development plus roof to the rear visible from St James' Lane. It should also be noted that the houses opposite are elevated from St James' Lane and accessed via an upper walkway.

The proposal is considered compliant with the Building Research Establishment (BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: a guide to good practice) as referenced in the London Plan Policy D6 and DM1, section 2.10 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

The Officers Report acknowledges this;

1. *The amenity and living conditions of neighbouring properties would not be unduly harmed.*
2. *...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 above point would suggest that the proposed size, scale and massing of the development is appropriate by virtue of having no negative impact to neighbouring amenity.

2. Form

The officers report notes that

'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.'

We draw attention to other properties in the immediate area which feature mansard roof designs. The first image is taken from the entrance door of No. 75 Hillfield Park and shows a two storey mansard to Bishops View Court.



The second image is of residential houses on Hillfield Park, some 50m to the North of the proposed site showing mansard roof forms. The includes a side facing mansard at second floor level.



Both images clearly demonstrate up to two storey mansard roof designs; of equal or larger size/scale/massing, whilst demonstrating the presence of mansard forms in the immediate context. These examples are visible, and therefore contribute to, the character and appearance of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

3. Impact on the host building, street scene and Conservation Area including character and appearance

Proposed materials include; slate, timber sliding sash windows and any minor brickwork alterations would be to match existing. These materials are integral to the existing host building, street scene and in forming the common character of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area.

As addressed elsewhere, the mansard form is present in the immediate context and measures have been taken to maintain its subservience.

We note that the Conservation Area appraisal references the flank elevation of No. 75 Hillfield Park;

- 1. No. 75 at the end of the terrace has its entrance doorway and porch within an attractive flank elevation onto St James Lane that is of yellow stock brick with red brick dressings.*

The applicant maintains the property to a high standard and the mansard addition is an example of the ongoing need to upkeep the property with no intentions to diminish the features noted above.

4. Design

As Architects, we hold ourselves to our own highest standards of design. The proposal emerged from an iterative internal design process. We have demonstrated elsewhere that the form, scale and materiality are present and consistent within the immediate locality. The proposal also allows the growing family to adapt to better suit their needs as a family now and in the years ahead.

We therefore believe that the proposal satisfies the intentions of Local Plan Policy SP11 and DPD Policies DM1 and DM12 in respect of design.

5. Windows

The existing flank elevation of the proposed site feature 11no. window and 1no. door opening across ground and first floors. The application proposes 3no. additional windows and whilst these sit slightly forward of the flank elevation, they have little to no additional impact on amenity over and above the existing situation. The Officers report acknowledges this as outlined previously in this report and any measures to ensure this could have been easily managed by condition where appropriate as the Officer notes;

- 1. However, if this application were to be approved, a condition could be attached requiring the fitting of obscured glazing in this new window.*

General

Paragraph 38 of the NPPF requires that in decision making, local authorities should; *'...approach decisions on proposed development in a positive and creative way', and; 'work proactively with applicants to secure developments that will improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. Decision-makers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible.'*

It should also be noted that we attempted to contact Case Officer James Mead in advance of determination to understand and resolve any potential concerns to no response. We feel that the standard of the NPPF has not been met in the determination of this application.

Conclusions

We believe the proposed development at 75 Hillfield Park comprises a modest, well-designed and subservient addition to the dwelling, which sits acceptably against the host property with no loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers. No material conflict therefore arises with those provisions of Policies D3 & HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 & SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DMI, DM9 & DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

We trust that the enclosed information is in order and should you wish to discuss the matter further, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,
on behalf of Native North Ltd.

Justin Brown

BArch (Hons) Dip Arch (ARB)