

HGY/2023/2691: 29 Milton Park: demolish extension and erect new dwelling

It would appear that people in support of this application may be unaware that Haringey's decision to refuse an earlier application was upheld at Appeal.

These extracts set out the background to the current application:

Appeal Inspector's Costs Decision:

4. Therefore, although the appellants may disagree with the views expressed in the Council's evidence, it seems to me that the Council has provided a reasonable explanation to justify its stance on these matters. Neither the Officer Report nor the Council Appeal Statement say that all proposals for development must be resisted, as the appellants suggest.

As reported by the Applicants in the DAS:

1.7 The Planning Inspector did not accept the LPA view that the site was a conscious design decision. Further despite the advice of the LPA in the pre-application engagement that the LPA did not support the principle of a new dwelling on the site – the Inspector concluded that the LPA did not say that all proposals for the site should be resisted. (Paragraph 4 – Costs Decision 20 September 2023).

HCAAC however notes that the Appeal Inspector's point was significantly different:

Appeal Inspector's Decision on the Appeal:

8. The proposed dwelling would be taller and wider than the existing single storey extension and would fill most of the open space between the appeal property and No 29 Milton Road. While a small gap would be retained, it would give the appearance of a continuous line of development that would wrap around the corner of the street, effectively merging the terraced housing in Milford Road with the appeal property in Milford Park. This would undermine the prevailing pattern of development in Milton Park where similar pairs of semi-detached dwellings are clearly separated from the terraced housing.

9. Furthermore, the flat roof and relatively low height of the proposed dwelling means that it would appear very different from surrounding properties. Glazed elements to the side of the dwelling and on the roof terrace would contrast sharply with the older style properties that would surround it. This would draw undue attention to the dwelling on a prominent corner site, distracting from the architectural qualities of the street scene in Milford Park and Milford Road. Although the Conservation Area Appraisal supports contemporary buildings, this is only where they are sympathetic to their surroundings.

10. Overall, the proposed development would be a more harmful addition than the existing side extension is. It would undermine the significance of the Conservation Area in this location. Although the harm would be less than substantial, the benefits of the proposal would be entirely private in nature and so would not outweigh the harm I have identified.

11. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

Conclusion

*13. The development would be energy efficient and I attach some weight to the benefits of providing a new home. However, these benefits would be relatively modest given the small scale of the development. **When considered as a whole, the benefits of the proposal are insufficient to outweigh the harm to the***

mindful of paragraph 199 of the Framework which says that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, 'great weight' should be given to the asset's conservation.

14. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee notes that the Appeal Decision is dated 20 September 2023 and the current application was validated by Haringey on 13 October 2023 which suggests the design and all the accompanying material was prepared in haste or was ready whatever the Inspector might decide. The result inevitably is that the design shows little respect for nor takes on board the Inspector's opinions. The Inspector found that the design caused less than substantial harm (but nevertheless harm) to the Conservation Area, a heritage asset, harm which would not be offset by any public benefit.

It would be inappropriate and obtuse in the interests of good planning for HCAAC to ignore the Appeal Inspector's Decision and therefore this application should be refused.