



Officer Report

Application Number:

HGY/2023/2318

Application Type:

Householder planning permission

Address:

98 Palmerston Road, London N22 8RE

Proposal:

Improvement of a thermal element of a property. Installing External Wall Insulation cladding to a semi-detached property. External Wall Insulation to the front, left-hand side and rear elevations of the property excluding rear connected outbuilding. Insulation system comprising of 100mm Licata insulation system with a Licata silicone render system which is to be hand applied and finished in clients chosen texture in a neutral light/medium colour. All enabling works such as window cills, rainwater systems etc. will be modified and reinstalled where required. The system is designed to be low maintenance.

Case Officer:

Zara Seelig

Valid Date:

29/08/202

3

Applicant:

Mr Muftao Abdullah

Agent:

Mr Adeel Ahmad

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Site Description

The site is a two storey semi detached dwelling situated on the Eastern side of Palmerston Road. The site is located within the Bowes Park Conservation Area, it is not a listed building.

Description of Development

Improvement of a thermal element of a property. Installing External Wall Insulation cladding to a semi-detached property. External Wall Insulation to the front, left-hand side and rear elevations of the property excluding rear connected outbuilding. Insulation system comprising of 100mm Licata insulation system with a Licata silicone render system which is to be hand applied and finished in clients chosen texture in a neutral light/medium colour. All enabling works such as window cills, rainwater systems etc. will be modified and reinstalled where required. The system is designed to be low maintenance.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

None

Consultation Response

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal: LBH Conservation Officer: Consulted - Objection: See Conservation section of the report below.

External: None

Local Representations

The application has been publicised by way of 26 neighbour consultation letters. A site notice was sent to the agent to display, a photograph of it in situ was sent to the council and shows it was displayed on 15th September 2023.

No of individual responses: none

The following local groups/societies were consulted:

- None

The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

Conservation officers concerns set out below.

Material Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and appearance;
2. Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area; and
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design and Appearance and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

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 set 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 respect 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.

The proposal would introduce a 100mm build out on the existing wall of the property, which being one of a pair of semi-detached properties would jar substantially with the adjoining semi, in terms of the appearance of the pair, further impacting the uniformity within the street. Furthermore the loss of the existing brick detailing would also have an impact on the pair of semi's and the visual consistency of the row. As such the proposal would be unacceptable in terms of design due to it adversely interrupting the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties of which it is one. This in turn adversely impacts the street scene and appears at odds and jars with the property of which it is attached as a pair of semi-detached buildings appearing out of character. The proposal would result in the loss of architectural features that are consistent within the row.

In terms of the proposals impact on the conservation area, the conservation officer commented as follows:

"Bowes Park Conservation Area is a good example of the scale and type of residential development that occurred in the latter half of the 19th century, driven in large part by the improvements in transport, particularly the new railway lines, enabling more people to move out of central London to new communities within commuting distance of the city. The Conservation Area derives its special interest from the surviving Victorian and Edwardian houses - predominantly terraced or semi-detached - that were built over a period of several decades as the local transport network expanded.

No 98 is considered to positively contribute to the significance of the Bowes Park Conservation Area. This is because it forms part of Nos. 96-100, a long series of two-storey Edwardian semi-detached houses in red brick with shallow hipped slate roofs and bracketed eaves. The ground floors have a central entrance with a Baroque-style 'shell' door-hood, flanked by a polygonal bay window and a triple-light window linked by a string-course. The upper-floor windows have scroll-profile mullions; some original sashes with four-pane upper lights survive. The Edwardian features and materials consistent across the group, which share characteristics with the wider area contribute towards the significance of the Conservation Area as a good example of a distinctive suburban typology of the mid-late Victorian and Edwardian period.

It is noted that the heritage statement is poor and does not discuss the significance of the conservation area, nor how the building contributes to this significance. This does not comply with policy DM9. Additionally, there appears to be some incorrect information provided in the statement, the existing cills do not appear to be uVPC, and the string course does not appear to be formed of timber. It is unclear how some of these features would not be affected by the proposed works when some of their detailing (if not all) is shallower than 100mm.

The proposed external insulation is a significant concern. Generally exposed original brickwork within the Conservation Area should not be clad. This would significantly affect the appearance of the building and the wider group to which it belongs and would lose its consistency including the flush external finishes. Additionally, it would lose some features altogether and the definition of others, including the segmental brick arches above the ground floor windows would be fully concealed. Overall, the proposed works would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Bowes Park Conservation Area by eroding the essential Edwardian characteristics of the building as part of the distinctive and cohesive Edwardian streetscape.

As the Bowes Park Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and any harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against public (not private) benefits. Accordingly, as the proposals are considered to cause less than harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, Conservation would not support this application.

If the previous rendering and/or painting is trapping moisture it is recommended that this is appropriately removed. The STBA and Historic England's guides to wall insulation provide good advice on insulation for solid walls, including internal solutions which would be more appropriate in this context."

Limited information has been submitted, no sectional plans have been submitted to show how the proposal would look with a stepped forward front elevation to the attached semi detached property. No details have been submitted regarding quantifying the benefits of the scheme in terms of sustainability etc. Considering the impact the proposal has, in terms of design and impact on the conservation area, there doesn't appear to be any public benefit from the scheme to outweigh this harm. Furthermore, the heritage statement is lacking and does not make a proper assessment on this, the councils conservation team have, and consider the proposal is unacceptable.

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.

The proposal is not considered to adversely impact the amenities of these neighbouring properties by reason of overbearingness, loss of daylight/sunlight or loss of privacy and the proposal complies with London Plan Policy D6 and DPD Policy DM1.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of design and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area, in addition to limited information submitted and so does not comply with relevant planning policy.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

Recommendation

REFUSE permission for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development due to the proposed alterations to the external appearance of the front elevation would be out of keeping with the general pattern and character of the area and would adversely impact the street scene by reason of its interruption with the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached properties, of which it is one, contrary to policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and policies DM1 & DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

The proposed development, by reason of inappropriate design and materials, would introduce incongruent additions to the building that would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bowes Park Conservation Area, contrary to Development Management DPD (2017) policies DM1 and DM9, Local Plan (2017) Policies SP11 and SP12, London Plan Policy HC1 and the NPPF.

Insufficient information has been provided, the heritage statement is lacking in detail and does not discuss the significance of the conservation area, nor how the building contributes to this significance and there has been no information/details submitted to quantify the benefits of the proposal or to justify it outweighing the harm caused to the street scene and conservation area. This is contrary to policy DM9 of the Development Management DPD (2017).