

# Officer's Report

|                           |                                                                                 |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number</b> | <b>HGY/2023/0145</b>                                                            |
| <b>Type</b>               | <b>Householder planning permission</b>                                          |
| <b>Location</b>           | 62 Cromwell Avenue, Hornsey, London, N6 5HL                                     |
| <b>Proposal</b>           | Erection of a single storey, lean-to side infill extension to the ground floor. |
| <b>Case Officer</b>       | Sabelle Adjagboni                                                               |
| <b>Valid Date</b>         | 17/01/2023                                                                      |
| <b>Applicant</b>          | Prof. Tom Henry                                                                 |
| <b>Agent</b>              | Mr Justin Brown                                                                 |

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Refuse**

## **PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS**

### **Proposed development**

This is an application for the erection of a single storey side infill at the front of the property.

### **Site and Surroundings**

The application site is a two-storey semi-detached property located next to the junction of Cromwell Avenue and Winchester Place. The properties here are red-brick, semi-detached Victorian villas elevated above street level and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance to this part of Highgate Conservation Area.

### **Relevant Planning and Enforcement history**

The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows:

HGY/2023/0222 - Works to trees in Conservation Area - Elder T1 and Elder T2 - No objection

HGY/1999/0108 - Erection of first floor hardwood conservatory painted white (fully glazed) and provision of flank window at ground floor existing rear addition. - Granted

### **Consultation response**

One objection from the Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee has been received, as summarised as follows:

1. No Design and Access statement; (Comment: The nature/ size of the extension does not trigger the need for a D&A).
2. Proposal will be detrimental to the appearance of the conservation area.
3. The Winchester Hall Estate shows two main, carefully arranged forms: Houses which give the appearance of being semi-detached but their rear extensions are actually joined.
4. Pairs of semi-detached houses placed on corners which frame the linked houses mentioned above, some specifically designed to "turn the corner".

5. It is very evident that the unusual serpentine layout of the street was very carefully considered. This is probably the only group of streets in Haringey where the road layout took advantage of the significant viewpoints at each junction.
6. The proposed extension would fundamentally alter the symmetry of the pairs of houses as originally laid out.

## **LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS**

The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 6 letters. No representations were received.

## **MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and heritage;
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

### **Design and heritage**

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 sets out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respects and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

DH4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan states that side extensions to detached or semi-detached properties, including the enlargement of existing garages, should be sensitive to and respect the character of the streetscape, and not block or significantly infill gaps between buildings, or otherwise disrupt the integrity of the individual architectural composition or group where these contribute to the character of the local area. They should be subordinate in scale to the original dwelling and complement its character in terms of design, proportion, materials and detail. They should not harm the amenity of adjacent properties.

The proposal is for a side infill extension that would have a wedged shape given its siting to the side of the flank wall to this property and its tapering boundary. The extension would finish flush with the front building line and have a pitched roof with a ridge height of 3.2m and an eaves height of 2.6m. Such an extension by reason of its siting would be dominant and highly visible in views from within the street, taking from the architectural composition of this property and symmetry with the adjoining property and overall not respecting the pattern of development to this area.

The siting of such an extension would also encroach into an important gap which currently provides a break and visual separation between this property and the neighbouring property at No 2 Winchester Place. Equally the siting of such an extension here would result in the loss of two trees,

undermining the important value trees and vegetation have here in providing a pleasant, verdant and spacious character to the street scene.

Therefore concluding, the proposal would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the conservation area. While the harm to the designated heritage asset would be less than substantial, nevertheless considerable importance and weight has to be applied to protecting the character, appearance and distinctiveness to these houses.

While it is noted that some houses on Winchester Place have been extended by way of side extensions, such examples are limited with no planning history and as such cannot be taken as a precedent. Such extensions are likely to be a legacy of 'permitted development rights' and importantly predate the adoption of the HNP (2017), which as discussed above has a specific policy on side extensions.

### **Impact on neighbouring amenity**

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

Given the proposed extension is single storey and there being no windows to habitable rooms on the ground floor of the neighbouring property, the proposal would not impact neighbouring amenity in terms of conditions of daylight, sunlight or outlook. Equally such an extension would not impact on privacy.

### **CIL APPLICABLE**

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

REFUSE PERMISSION

### **Refusal Reasons:**

The proposed extension by virtue of its siting would be dominant and imposing in views and would negatively intrude into the visual gap to the side of this property, disrupting the architectural composition to this house and the pattern of development of the area, overall harming the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area, contrary to Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017), as well as Policies DH2 and DH4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017).

