



FAO: Planning Department,
Haringey London Borough Council

Ref: HGY/2023/0445
Date: 04/05/2023

HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION ADVICE

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: 37 Stormont Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4NR.

Built Heritage Advice pertaining to an application for: Erection of first floor and 2x ground floor extensions. Loft conversion incorporating 2x small front and 1x full width rear dormers. Alterations to internal layout. Erection of single storey rear outbuilding, formation of outdoor swimming pool and associated landscaping to the rear garden including replacement of 5 existing trees.

The proposed development site (the Site) is located in Sub Area 7 (Bishops) of the Highgate Conservation Area.

In statutory terms the significance of the heritage asset has been recognised by its designation as a conservation area, which reflects its 'special interest'. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act 1990) states that Local Planning Authorities have a statutory duty to ensure that 'special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

Furthermore, 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 Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAAMP) provides commentary on this part of the conservation area and states:

The earliest houses, built in 1906, stand near Hampstead Lane. These are nos. 1-5, all of which were designed by John Farrer, an architect who had been responsible for substantial development in the 1980s in Crouch End. The houses have an Edwardian character with pebble dashed facades. However, some Victorian styling remains, such as the corbelled parapet gable ends on no. 3 which is locally listed.



In the remainder of the street, the Arts and Crafts style prevails except where rebuilding or redesign has led to the introduction of overbearing front elevations with inappropriate front porches. The tendency to enlarge the footprint of the houses has obscured the gaps between buildings, restricting the views to rear gardens. Similarly the tress remaining from the Bishop's wood have been felled to the detriment of the conservation area.

The Site is less characterful than many of the dwellings along Stormont Road, boasting few details of special artistic or architectural interest. As such, it makes a neutral contribution to the conservation area. It does, however, provide for largely legible gaps between buildings despite the single-storey side extension/garage, and this is a positive characteristic of the streetscene and conservation area.

There are concerns regarding the proposed first-floor side extension to the south-west elevation. The height, scale and massing of the new proposed side extension would obscure the gap between the Site and No. 35 which is a positive feature of the streetscene and conservation.

The massing of the proposed extension in relation to the existing dwelling would result in a solid bulky character and appearance which would represent a departure from the prevalent Arts and Crafts style along Stormont Road.

The proposed design changes also fail to respond to, or reinforce, the characteristic Arts and Crafts style of the area; flat roof dormers, large window lights free of glazing bars or ornamentation, wrap-around glazing, and flat roof porches are not associated with the Arts and Crafts style or Edwardian architecture.

Taken together the proposals would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, contrary to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF. Consequently, the proposals would constitute a scheme which would lead to less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, making Paragraph 202 of the NPPF. Furthermore, no clear and convincing justification for that harm has been provided, contrary to Paragraph 200 of the NPPF.

The harm may potentially be mitigated by omitting the first-floor side extension; there may be an opportunity to increase the proposed rear elevation to achieve an increase in floor space. Introducing pitch roof dormers, reconfiguring the proposed fenestration to better respond to the surrounding Arts and Crafts style, and omitting the wrap-around glazing, may also address design concerns.

Overall, the proposals are in conflict with, or engage, Paragraphs 197c, 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