



FAO: Planning Department,
Haringey London Borough Council

Ref: HGY/2022/4240
Date: 04/05/2023

HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION ADVICE

Dear Sir / Madam,

RE: 21 Eastern Road, Hornsey, London, N2 9LD.

Built Heritage Advice pertaining to an application for: Erection of single storey rear extension, installation of rear dormer, installation of rooflights, replacement of windows, re-painting of front elevation, alterations to rear patio area with balustrades, retaining walls and works to rear stairs. Creation of vehicular crossover, provision of new front boundary treatment with replacement gates and rebuilt piers/railings.

The proposed development site (the Site) is located within the Fortis Green 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.

Insufficient information has been provided regarding the special interest of the designated heritage asset and the contribution, if any, the Site makes to that significance. Any scheme which has the potential to affect the significance of a heritage asset should be informed by an adequate heritage baseline. This is a requirement of the NPPF and is also good practice to ensure a high-quality scheme is realised.

Paragraph 194 of the NPPF states that:



*In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. **The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.** As a minimum the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary. Where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where necessary, a field evaluation.*

The following publications and advice notes from Historic England are useful guidance in producing heritage statements/statements of significance:

- Historic England Advice Note 1: Conservation Area Appraisal, Designation and Management (Second Edition)
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 2: Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets – (Second Edition)
- Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning 12: Statements of Heritage Significance

Notwithstanding the absence of a heritage statement, the Site is considered to make a positive contribution to the Fortis Green Conservation Area. The Site appears on the First Edition Ordnance Survey map (1883) and represents the first phases of the mid-Victorian development of the southern section of Eastern Road. It is one of a pair of semi-detached two-storey over basement townhouses constructed with hipped roof, brick chimneystacks, two-story bay window to basement and ground-floor, ornate door surround with pilasters and entablature, and timber sash windows. Taken together, the Site and No. 23 retains their original and intended symmetry.

There are concerns regarding the scale and design of the proposals.

The proposed rear dormer appears excessively large and visually overbearing relative to the Site concealing the entirety of the rear roof slope. Coupled with the existing loft extension, it would obscure the architectural composition of the host dwelling and would dominate the rear elevation.

There are also concerns regarding the proposed rooflights to the street-facing and side roof slopes, both of which are visible from the street; rooflights are incongruous features within Victorian 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.

By reason of design and scale, the proposals would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the 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 relevant. Furthermore, no clear and convincing justification for that harm has been provided, contrary to Paragraph 200.

This harm may be mitigated by omitting the front and side rooflights and reducing the width of the proposed dormer and retaining a gap above and below the respective eaves and ridge heights of the main roof. The dormer should not read as a top-heavy and visually dominant addition which subsumes the original roof of the Site, as the proposed dormer would. Rather, it should be subordinate and subservient to the original roof so that the original intended form and architecture remains legible; this would, at a minimum, preserve the character and appearance of the Fortis Green Conservation Area.

Overall, the proposals are in conflict with, or engage, Paragraphs 194, 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