

HGY/2023/2691
29 Milton Park, London, N6 5QB

Application Number: HGY/2023/2691

Application Type: Full planning permission

Address: 29 Milton Park, Hornsey, London, N6 5QB

Proposal: Demolition of existing side extension of 29 Milton Park and erection of a new dwelling with a basement.

Case Officer: Eunice Huang

Valid Date: 13/10/2023

Applicant: Mr. and Ms. John Healy Siobhan O'Shaughnessy

Agent: Mr Michael Rushe

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

2.1 This application is for demolition of existing side extension of 29 Milton Park and erection of a new dwelling with a basement.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The site is occupied by a two storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse, which has been enlarged to the eastern side through a single storey side extension. To the east of the built form of the property, and within the site boundary, there is a hardstanding area used for off-street parking. This property sits on the southern side of Milton Park, but also on the corner of this route with Milton Road. Opposite the site on Milton Park there is a row of terraced properties and adjacent to the south-east on Milton Road there is another line of residential terraces. This property is located in the Miltons, which is a residential area, characterised by late 19th century terraced properties and some semi-detached dwellings. Many of the residential properties in the Miltons are of similar or identical appearance and this provides a visual uniformity to the area. The site is situated within the Highgate Conservation Area (CA) and the homogenous appearance of the Miltons is the special interest of this particular area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

2.3 The most recent planning history relating to the site as is as follows:

- HGY/2022/2318: Demolition of existing side extension of 29 Milton Park and erection of a new dwelling with a basement. Refused 17 October 2022. Appeal dismissed 20 September 2023.
- HGY/2010/0298: Demolition of existing detached garage. Permission not required.
- HGY/2010/0297: Demolition of existing detached garage and erection of single storey side extension, rear dormer window including internal alterations. Granted.
- OLD/1960/0488: Two garages at side of house with access from Milton Road. Granted.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The following responses were received following consultation on the application:

- 1) LBH Conservation: Objects to the application. As set out in the previous response to application (HGY/2022/2318) and the planning inspectors decision, the principle of infilling the space between 29 Milton Park and 29 Milton Road with an additional dwelling would erode the original layout and urban form of this part of the Conservation Area. This would negatively impact on the legibility and experience of its distinctive, well-preserved and homogeneous townscape and appearance and would reduce the appreciation of how this contributes to the significance of the Conservation Area and would accordingly be considered to cause less than substantial harm.

This harm is also set out in the HGY/2022/2318 planning inspectors decision, paragraph 8, in which they stated infilling the gap would: "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 Milton 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."

This aspect of the proposed development has not altered since the previously dismissed application. The proposed house would wrap around and infill the corner merging the housing on Milton Road and Milton Park would infill the gap between. This would undermine the pattern of development and would erode the original layout and urban form of this part of the Conservation Area where similar pairs of semi-detached dwellings are clearly separated from the terraced housing.

Furthermore, the design, scale and landscaping would be considered to cause harm to the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area. The relatively lower height of the building, its flat-topped, stepped pyramid roof and large glazed elements contrast with the adjacent Edwardian buildings. This would draw attention to the building which would be located on a prominent corner site and would only have limited landscaping to soften this, and only to one side. Overall, the proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area as it would negatively impact on the legibility of the pattern of development of this part of the Conservation Areas distinctive, well-preserved and homogeneous townscape.

- 2) Thames Water: No objection with regard to Thames Water infrastructure or surface water drainage. Thames Water advises that the proposed development is located within 15 metres of their underground waste water assets. In order to prevent sewage flooding, the applicant is requested to installing a positive pumped device (or equivalent reflecting technological advances), on the assumption that the sewerage network may surcharge to the ground in storm conditions. The developer is expected to demonstrate what measures will be undertaken to minimise groundwater discharges into the public sewer. The discharge ground water to the public network would require a Groundwater Risk Management Permit from Thames Water. In regard to surface water drainage, if the developer follows the sequential approach to the disposal of surface water there is no objection.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The application has been publicised by way of press advert, site notice and letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 22

Support: 6

Object: 16

4.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee (HCAAC) – Objects to the application. The appeal for HGY/2022/2318 was dismissed on 20 September 2023 and this proposal does not satisfactory address the Inspector's decision, which found that the design caused less than substantial (but nevertheless harm) to the Conservation Area, which would not be offset by any public benefit.
- The Highgate Society – Objects to the application. Referencing the appeal decision for HGY/2022/2318, an essential element in the refusal was the principle of infilling the open corners between the two terraces of Edwardian Houses. The proposal is similar to the refused scheme, but reduced by one storey and does not address the principle infilling the gap. There is inadequate information in respect to section drawings, solar panels, Passivhaus, daylight studies, boundary wall details. The proposed design of the house is discordant with the surrounds and features a mix of styles. The solar panels would project above the roofline and face north, which constrains their functionality. There will be poor internal amenity for the basement bedrooms.
- Highgate Neighbourhood Forum – There is insufficient outside space and insufficient planting. There is no Tree Report to assess the impact on local trees, including a young street tree planted immediately outside the site. There is no plan to protect the house from future tree root impacts.

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

- New dwelling detracts from the conservation area. The design and materials are not sympathetic to the surrounding development.
- Proposal does not address the issues raised in the refusal and appeal dismissal of HGY/2022/2318, particularly in relation to harm upon the conservation area.
- Pressure on parking as parking spaces will be lost in area under parking stress.
- Daylight and sunlight impacts.
- Basement excavation creates a risk to neighbouring properties and may have adverse flooding and drainage impacts.

- Demolition of existing extension would be a loss of a sensitive harmonious development, resulting in loss of light and amenity to the existing property, and is not environmental friendly.
- The development does not provide 'much needed' housing, because it is unlikely to be affordable.
- Development will impact access to mains gas pipeline, cabling ports and gutter of No. 29 Milton Road (*Officer note: This is not a material planning consideration*).
- Tree impacts including young street tree outside the site.
- Dwelling overlooks adjoining gardens.
- Insufficient outside space and insufficient planting.
- Noise and disruption to existing infrastructure in the short to medium term (*Officer note: Disruption from construction is temporary impact that can be mitigated through conditions*).
- Insufficient consultation with neighbours (*Officer note: The application was open for public consultation as per the minimum 21 day consultation period*).
- Linking two buildings numbered 29 creates even greater confusion for deliveries (*Officer note: This is not a material planning consideration*).

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of Development;
2. Design, Appearance & Heritage;
3. Quality of Residential Accommodation;
4. Neighbour Amenity;
5. Basement Development;
6. Transport; and
7. Energy & Sustainability.

Principle of Development

5.2 London Plan Policy H1 and Table 4.1 identify the overall housing targets for Boroughs (Haringey's 10-year target – 15,920). In addition, London Plan Policy H2 sets out a presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) and in Table 4.2 a minimum target for housing delivery on small sites is identified for Boroughs (Haringey's 10-year target is 2,600). This scheme would

deliver one new dwelling on this site. As such, this proposal would make a minor contribution to the overall housing target for the Borough, as well as the housing delivery target for small sites.

Design and appearance

5.3 London Plan Policy D3 requires all new development to make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites. This policy also notes that proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness, through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Developments should respond to the existing character of a place by identifying the special and valued features and characteristics that are unique to the locality. In line with Local Plan Policy SP11, proposals should be of the highest standard of design that respects local context, character and historic significance, to contribute to Haringey's sense of place. Development should relate positively to the locality having regard to prevailing: building heights, form, scale, massing, urban grain, plot widths and architectural styles/detailing/materials, in line with DPD Policy DM1.

5.4 In regard to proposals in CAs, the Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to ensure that the historic significance of these heritage assets is preserved or enhanced. London Plan Policy HC1 requires developments to conserve the significance of heritage assets by being sympathetic to the assets significance and appreciation within the surroundings. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 note that proposals should ensure the conservation of the historic significance of heritage assets and their setting. The preservation of the historic form, function and character of CAs should be secured, in accordance with DPD Policy DM9.

Urban Grain of the CA

5.5 As already acknowledged, the site is located in the Miltons and the Highgate CA Appraisal notes that the layout of this area is of a tight, residential suburb, with a homogenous character and streets generally in a grid pattern. The Miltons would have been originally built out in this manner in the late 19th century and this pattern of development remains legible and intact. The street layout with its angled junctions is a response to the wider site constraints of the railway. The architectural consistency of 'The Miltons' as a whole is a key component this distinctive and homogenous historic area. These historic features are retained and generally in good condition.

5.6 Milton Road, Milton Avenue and the southward running part of Milton Park are predominantly lined by residential terraces. However, at the northern end of these roads at the junction with Milton Park exists a pair of semi-detached properties (three pairs in total) – 29-31 Milton Park, 25-27 Milton Park and 37-39 Milton Avenue themselves, which display architectural consistency. The built form of these properties reflect the angled street pattern, with gaps for gardens at each site, which visually and spatially separate the buildings from the row of terraces. The semi-detached properties and the associated open land on the junctions were part of the original layout of the Miltons. The urban grain and architectural form is therefore an important part of the areas architectural interest and historic interest.

5.7 The land directly to the east of the main property at 29 Milton Park is currently occupied by a pitched roof single storey side extension and a hardstanding parking area. It is proposed to remove this single storey extension, and then erect a new dwelling. This new dwelling would wrap around and infill the corner of Milton Park and Milton Road to adjoin with 29 Milton Road. As noted above, the gap between 29 Milton Park and 29 Milton Road forms part of the original layout and aesthetic of the Miltons. The infilling of this gap, with built form wrapping around the corner, would erode the original layout and urban form of this part of the CA. The other semi-detached dwellings along this part of the Miltons have not had the eastern part of their plot infilled to such level, and as such there is no example to replicate in this locality.

5.8 This observation is backed up by the Conservation Officer who describes outlines that the proposal would negatively impact on the legibility of its distinctive, well-preserved and homogeneous townscape and appearance. It would reduce the appreciation of how the site contributes to the significance of the Conservation Area and would accordingly be considered to cause less than substantial harm.

5.9 This harm is also set out in the HGY/2022/2318 planning inspectors decision, paragraph 8, in which they stated with regard to infilling the gap that: "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."

5.10 Similar to the refused scheme under HGY/2022/2318, the proposal uses a glazed link to connect to the adjoining property at 29 Milton Road to the east, with the aim of allowing views of the flank wall of this terrace. The western flank wall of the proposed dwelling is setback from 29 Milton Park Road, like the HGY/2022/2318. However, this design solution does not overcome the principle of the infill development in this location, which harms the legibility of the allotment and development pattern by removing the sense of openness that separates the semi-detached dwelling from the terraced housing.

Design Specifics

5.11 The CA Appraisal outlines that the character of the Miltons is relatively homogenous and this homogeneity is indeed the special interest of the area. Milton Park, together with Milton Road and Milton Avenue, are noted in the CA appraisal as being the core area of the Miltons. The streets in this particular area are described as being of distinctive architectural quality and visual cohesion. The adjacent row of terraces on Milton Road (1 – 29) are specifically identified in the CA Appraisal, as positive contributors to the character of the CA. Furthermore, the consistent appearance of the three pairs of semi-detached properties on the corners means that these dwellings (including 29 Milton Park) do also contribute positively to the distinctive character of the CA.

5.12 The proposed dwelling would be of a two storey scale, with basement level accommodation. The relatively lower height of the building contrasts with the heights of the adjacent Edwardian buildings. Furthermore, the proposed design, including its flat-topped stepped pyramid roof, large glazed elements, and decorative corner feature draw attention to the building which is located on a prominent corner site. The dwelling design does not respond to the architectural details, features and proportions of adjoining properties. It would appear discordant within the street scene and detract from the CA.

5.13 The CA Appraisal notes that properties in this part of the Miltons generally incorporate steeply pitched roofs and pedimented dormer windows. It is also acknowledged that several of the dwellings on Milton Park are of simple pitched roof form. The proposed flat-topped stepped pyramid roof design would be unique, and would not be reflective of the form of properties in the street scene. Instead, it is considered that this roof design would appear alien in this locality. Therefore, the proposed design and form of the dwelling would visually conflict with the more traditional properties evident in the street scene.

5.14 The boundary treatment at the front of the site currently comprises a low brick wall, with hedging above. The existing wall and the planting are in keeping with the green appearance of this street scene, which incorporates trees and boundary hedges along the frontage of properties. This scheme seeks to replace part of the front wall, with a new wall with planting trough to maintain hedging on the northern portion of the site.

5.15 The agent has, in their Heritage Statement, extensively highlighted the commentary in the CA Appraisal, which refers to the site as a 'jarring note' in the townscape. It appears that the agent considers that this proposed scheme would alleviate this jarring impact. It is highlighted that the 'jarring note' arises from the existing infilling of the gap between 29 Milton Road and 29 Milton Park with a side extension and hardstand parking. It is considered that the proposed development will not alleviate this concern through the addition of an unsympathetic dwelling, which would degrade the spatial and visual gap. Rather, the proposed development would cause more harm to the significance of the Conservation Area than the existing side extension and parking.

5.16 Overall, the proposed infilling of this corner plot would be at odds with the original urban layout of the Miltons and the original aesthetic of the area. The inappropriate size, scale, siting, massing, design and form of the proposed scheme would result in dwelling appearing as a dominant, incongruous, out of keeping and visually intrusive addition to the street scene. Furthermore, the proposed development would detract from the homogeneity of the Miltons and this part of the CA. It is considered that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area, the street scene and the CA. The historic significance and special interest of the CA would not be preserved. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to London Plan Policies D3 & HC1, Local Plan Policies SP11 & SP12, DPD Policies DM1, DM7 & DM9 and Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH2 & DH6.

5.17 Paragraph 202 of the NPPF notes that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. It is acknowledged that the proposal would provide one residential unit, which would contribute to the Borough's housing targets. However, the small size of the development means that this contribution would be minor. Given this, only minimal weight can be assigned to the housing delivery. No other tangible public benefits

would arise from the scheme. The only minor weight assigned to the housing delivery means that the harm to the character and historic significance of the CA would not be outweighed.

Quality of Residential Accommodation

5.18 London Plan Policy D6 requires housing development to provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts. Dwellings must provide at least the gross internal floor area (GIA) set out in Table 3.1 of the London Plan and an acceptable floor to ceiling height should be delivered. Dual aspect dwellings should be maximised and single aspect dwellings should normally be avoided, in line with London Plan Policy D6. This policy also requires sufficient daylight and sunlight to be supplied to new housing. Private outdoor space should be provided for new dwellings, in accordance with London Plan Policy D6.

5.19 The GIA of the proposed dwelling would meet the London Plan space standards for three bedroom properties. As such, it is considered that the dwelling would be of satisfactory size for the desired type of accommodation. The floor to ceiling heights shown in the proposed sections would accord with the London Plan requirement.

5.20 The proposed residential unit would be dual aspect, which would provide satisfactory levels of light and ventilation to the ground and first floor levels. The basement level contains three bedrooms with windows to a lightwell adjacent to the Milton Road frontage. These windows face north-east to a 1.4m wide lightwell. The application has substantiated there would adequate daylight access to these bedrooms. However, the internal amenity of these basement bedrooms could be considered acceptable on balance with the satisfactory levels of amenity on the upper levels of the dwelling.

5.21 The dwelling is required to deliver a minimum of 8sqm of private outdoor space for its 5-person occupancy. 19sqm of private outdoor space is provided at the ground level, satisfying the requirement of London Plan Policy D6.

Neighbour Amenity

5.21 London Plan Policy D6 outlines that the design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific it is stated that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight that is appropriate for the context, while also

minimising overshadowing. Furthermore, DPD Policy DM1 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 open aspects to adjacent buildings and land. Schemes should also avoid overlooking and loss of privacy that would be detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

5.22 The proposed dwelling would adjoin 29 Milton Road (property to the south-east). While this proximity is noted, 29 Milton Road has no windows present on its northwestern elevation. Acknowledging this, it is not considered that undue loss of light or restriction of outlook would impact this neighbouring property. The proposed dwelling does not have windows or terraces that are directed towards the garden of 29 Milton Road. There is a rear terrace on the first floor level; however this terrace has been designed with a high level window for maintenance access only to plant equipment. As such, there would not be a material privacy impact upon 29 Milton Road. Nor would the proposed dwelling cause overshadowing on this outdoor space or cause overbearing impacts. The proposed dwelling height is relatively lower than 29 Milton Road and it is located to the north-east of this neighbouring terrace.

5.23 The other property neighbouring the proposed development is 29 Milton Park (dwelling to the west). Again, the proposed dwelling height is relatively lower than 29 Milton Park. This neighbouring property has no windows present on its eastern elevation. Therefore, loss of light to windows or undue restriction of outlook would not arise. The siting of the proposed dwelling to the east of 29 Milton Park would ensure that excessive overshadowing of this neighbouring property would not occur. The proposed dwelling would be visible from the rear garden of 29 Milton Park and would fill the visual gap to the north-east of this outdoor space. While this is acknowledged, the rear garden of 29 Milton Park is already relatively enclosed to the eastern side. Noting this, it is not considered that the proposed dwelling would result in a materially harmful sense of enclosure or overbearing impact.

Basement development

5.24 DPD Policy DM18 outlines that extensions to existing basements and the construction of new basements will only be permitted where it can be demonstrated that the proposal:

- a) will not adversely affect the structural stability of the application building, neighbouring buildings and other infrastructure, including the adjoining highway, having regard to local geological conditions;
- b) does not increase flood risk to the property and nearby properties from any source;
- c) avoids harm to the appearance or setting of the property or the established character of the surrounding area;
- d) will not adversely impact the amenity of adjoining properties by reason of noise or increased levels of internal or external activity;
- e) will not adversely impact the local natural and historic environment;
- f) will not cause loss, damage or long-term threat to trees of townscape or amenity value;
- g) maintains adequate soil depth satisfactory for preservation of landscaping consistent with neighbouring properties;
- h) will not cause harm to pedestrian, cycle, vehicular and road safety, adversely affect bus or other transport operations, significantly increase traffic congestion, nor place unreasonable inconvenience on the day to day life of those, working or visiting nearby; and
- i) will minimise construction impacts such as noise, vibration and dust for the duration of the works.

5.25 Proposals for basements must also not include habitable rooms in areas prone to flooding, where there is no reasonable means of escape, in accordance with DPD DM18. Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH7 also outlines further criteria that proposed basements should align with.

5.26 The proposed scheme involves the creation of a basement and lightwell. Noting the requirements of DPD Policy DM18 and Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH7, a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) has been provided in support of the application. The BIA outlines the proposed construction method for the basement, with reinforced concrete walls forming the perimeter and foundations. Furthermore, the basement walls would be designed as retaining walls that would be capable of resisting lateral loads. There is no objection to this construction method and it is not considered that undue risk to the stability of neighbouring buildings would result. However, if this application were to be approved, a condition would be attached requiring that the construction of the basement is overseen by a suitably qualified structural engineer. Furthermore, a condition would be included requiring the submission of a Construction Management Plan. Subject to these conditions, there are not substantial

concerns from a planning perspective. However, it is emphasised that other legislation, outside the planning system, such as Building Regulations and the Party Wall Act should provide further safeguards for neighbouring properties.

5.27 The BIA explains that the retaining walls will be designed to allow for worst case groundwater conditions. Noting this, and given that the site is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3, it is not considered that there would be a material increased flood risk to resultant property or the neighbours. However, again further floor resilience measures would be likely to be considered at the detailed design stage of the basement.

5.28 The basement would not be highly visible from the street scene and it is noted that other properties in the locality incorporate basements/lightwells. Therefore, it is not considered that the basement, taken in isolation, would harm the character of the area. There is no evidence to suggest that the basement would adversely impact the historic or natural environment. If this application were to be approved, a Construction Management Plan would be required by condition. Through this approach, officers could seek to control the construction phase of works to limit disturbance to neighbours and reduce the chance of disruption to pedestrian, cycle or vehicular routes.

5.29 The scheme would provide three bedrooms within the basement and this can be a concern in areas prone to flooding. As already noted, the site is not within Flood Zones 2 or 3, and as such is at low risk of flooding from river sources. However, the site is located in an area at medium risk from surface water flooding and within a Critical Drainage Area (CDA). Whilst the medium surface water flood risk is acknowledged, reasonable means of escape would be possible from the basement in the event of a flood. A stairway would be constructed in the lightwell and direct access to the ground floor from the basement would be possible. Given these two possible means of escape, it is considered that satisfactory egress from the basement would be likely to be achieved if required.

5.30 In planning terms, the proposed basement is considered acceptable. However, more detailed investigations would be required through the Building Regulation process, so to feed into detailed foundation design and the construction phase, if this application were to be approved.

Transport

5.31 London Plan Policy T1 requires developments to make most effective use of land, reflecting connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking and cycling routes. Cumulative impacts of development on public transport and road network capacity, including walking and cycling, should be taken into account, in line with London Plan Policy T4. The Council will tackle climate change and improve transport quality/safety through: minimising congestion, promoting public transport/walking/cycling, promoting car sharing/car clubs and seeking to locate major trip generating development in locations with good access to public transport.

5.32 Developments should provide cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 of the London Plan. The cycle parking should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located, in accordance with London Plan Policy T5. Car-free development should be the starting point for all development in places that are well-connected by public transport, in line with London Plan Policy T6. The maximum parking standards of the London Plan should be applied to development proposals. The Council will support proposals for no on-site parking where: there are alternative means of transport available, public transport accessibility level (PTAL) is at least 4 and a controlled parking zone (CPZ) exists, in accordance with DPD Policy DM32.

5.33 The proposed delivery of one residential unit would not be a development of such scale that it would generate an excessive number of vehicular trips. As such, it is not considered that the capacity of the surrounding highways would be compromised. Furthermore, the modest nature of the development means that the capacity of public transport would not be materially impacted.

5.34 29 Milton Park is currently served by hardstanding area on the eastern side of the site, which allows the parking of two vehicles. These off-street parking spaces would be lost through the scheme, with no off-street parking re-delivered. Therefore, technically the scheme would be a car-free development. However, it is noted that the proposal outlines an intention to raise the existing dropped kerb on Milton Road and provide an additional on-street parking bay.

5.35 The site is situated in an area with a PTAL rating of 3, and therefore has 'moderate' access to public transport. The only moderate PTAL rating of the site means that a car-free development is not necessarily in full accordance with DPD Policy DM32. However, a Parking Stress Survey has been provided in support of this application. This supporting document suggests that there is some parking capacity on the surrounding

roads. Noting the findings of the Parking Stress Survey, and given the overall net loss of only one parking space, it is not considered that the proposed development would materially harm the availability of on-street parking in this locality. As such, this car-free development is considered acceptable, in this instance.

Energy & Sustainability

5.36 Local Plan Policy SP4 outlines that the Council will promote measures to reduce carbon emissions and energy use from new buildings during design, construction and occupation. This policy requires all new residential development from 2016 onwards to be zero carbon. DPD Policy DM21 notes that all new development should consider and implement sustainable design, layout and construction techniques. The energy hierarchy and cooling hierarchy should be applied to new developments. Building materials used should have high environmental performance ratings.

5.37 A Passive House Design Statement has been submitted for the application, demonstrating commitments for an energy efficient building. While this information is welcome, a full Energy Statement has not been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would achieve a satisfactory reduction of carbon emissions, with the requisite calculation sheets. In the absence of a full Energy Statement, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the scheme satisfy Local Plan Policy SP4 and DPD Policy DM21.

6 CONCLUSION

6.1 The proposal is considered unacceptable, as the proposed scheme would harm the character and appearance of the site, the street scene and the CA. The historic significance and special interest of the CA would not be preserved. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed dwelling would adequately reduce carbon emissions and limit energy use.

6.2 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.

7. CIL APPLICABLE

N/A

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate size, scale, siting, massing, and form design, would appear as an incongruous, out of keeping and visually intrusive addition to the street scene, as well as the Highgate Conservation Area. The proposed infilling of this corner plot would be at odds with the original urban layout and aesthetic of this area. The unreflective proportions, massing and form of the proposed dwelling means that it would detract from the homogenous character of the locality. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area, the street scene and the Conservation Area. The historic significance and special interest of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D3 & HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 & SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017), Policies DM1, DM7 & DM9 of the Development Management DPD (2017) and Policies DH2 and DH6 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017).
2. Insufficient information (in the form of an Energy Statement) has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would adequately reduce carbon emissions and limit energy use. In the absence of this information, the proposal would be contrary to Policy SP4 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD (2017).