

Eunice Huang

From: Ruth Mitchell1
Sent: 05 January 2024 18:03
To: Eunice Huang
Subject: 2 Broughton Gardens, Hornsey, London, N6 5RS

Hi Eunice,

2 Broughton Gardens lies within the Crouch End Conservation Area. Broughton Gardens is part of a 1930s development built in the Moderne/International style that also includes Nos. 44-48 and 50-54 on Shepherds Hill. The street is a small cul-de-sac between Nos. 48 and 50 Shepherds Hill made up of white rendered and painted three-storey houses with balconies and roof terraces. No. 5, is a later addition to the original group and terminates the view along Broughton Gardens. Several of the houses in the cul-de-sac have been subject to poor additions and alterations, though most of the major alterations were mid to late C20. Of the group, No. 2 is the best-preserved house, retaining its original appearance of brickwork and white render. The symmetry in form, two storeys with recessed main entrance, 1st floor balcony and set back 2nd floor with No. 1 also remains allowing an appreciation of the original form of the building and allows a better interpretation of the style of house. Accordingly, the front of the building is more sensitive to change than the rear, as the rear elevation which although partially visible from Stanhope Road is mostly obscured by trees. The building is considered to positively contribute to the significance of the Crouch End Conservation Area as the building has interest as an example from this period.

The submitted statement does not readily discuss the significance of the Crouch End Conservation Area, nor how the development site contributes to this significance and does not identify the remaining original features and form of the building which are important characteristics of building of this style and period. There is also no assessment of what the impact of the works would be on the significance of the heritage asset(s) affected contrary to policy DM9(b).

It is noted that the front elevation does not show the proposed plant on the roof, though the side elevations, plans and sections show that this would extend right up to the front elevation of the building.

The proposed ground floor extension is not overly large and would remain subservient to the existing building. This would have a neutral impact on the significance of the Conservation Area. The main concerns are the quite extensive alterations to the front of the building, including the upwards extension, recladding and replacing the windows and doors in a different style.

The proposed 2nd floor front extension would have a considerable impact on the original design of the building and would remove the horizontal emphasis of the building and unbalance the semi-detached pair creating a top-heavy design and would remove the appreciation of the original form of the building. The loss of the original form of the front elevation and would unbalance of the semi-detached pair of buildings would be considered to cause some harm to the significance of the Conservation Area as it would diminish the appreciation of the original design and its interest as a development of this period and style. The proposed metal coping detail would be an incongruous detail and it is recommended that this is removed, and a stone coping to match the existing building and rest of the development is used instead.

Additionally, the proposed rendering of the building in its entirety, including the areas which are currently exposed brickwork would result in the loss of the brickwork and its associated detailing and tiling features and this would the loss of these important features of the original Moderne/International style, in its entirety from the development and streetscene. From the elevation and the section the proposed render appears to be very deep

and this would remove the banding and tilling details which help give the building its horizontal emphasis – these remain on the adjoining No. 1. It is unclear if the render would result in a depth change at the property boundary with No.1. The loss of the brickwork and its associated detailing and tilling features would be considered to cause some harm to the significance of the Conservation Area.

There is no in principle objection to the replacement of the windows and doors as the existing are uVPC in a non-original style. There is a missed opportunity to return the windows and doors to the original design and windows as shown contribute to the loss of horizontality to the building. However this is, as discussed above, predominantly relating to the rendering and the size of the 2nd floor extension proposed. If these aspects are resolved (see below) there is no objection to the window alterations.

The proposed roof plant projects between 0.5-1m higher than the extent of the building and would go close the building edge, including the front elevation. It would likely be very visible from the streetscene (particularly considering the panels at No.3 which are located further back than those proposed – though it is unclear if these were installed in accordance with the approved plans as they were approved on the basis they wouldn't be visible from the street). Modern/international style buildings are supposed to have clean, uncluttered lines, including roofscapes. The proposed plant would be visible and would create a visually cluttered roofline which would be detrimental to the Conservation Area.

Overall the loss of the original, and balanced form of the existing building, its brickwork and tilling features and the creation of a visually cluttered roofscape would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Crouch End Conservation Area by degrading the most intact example of this interesting development through the loss of its remaining original features. As the proposal would cause harm to the significance of the conservation area, conservation does not support this proposal and it should be considered in line with and it should be considered in line with paragraphs 200, 205, 208 of the NPPF and local plan policy DM9(b).

There is likely to be a suitable solution for this site, but there this is likely to need some considerable changes, a pre-app may be beneficial. In summary the recommendations would be:

- Any 2nd floor extension should be at the building line and height as at No. 1 adjacent so that it is set back from the front wall and the original two storey element remains visible, as well as the symmetry of the pair
- The exterior is not completely rendered and the brickwork and tiling remain exposed
 - Retrofitting is supported in principle, however this needs to be undertaken in a sympathetic manner and there are a variety of ways which this could be achieved.
- The proposed PV panels and air conditioning units should be placed to not be visible from the streetscene
 - The proposed rear GF extension could provide a more hidden location for some of the larger/taller plant.
 - Assessing views would help determine suitable locations.

Kind regards,

Ruth Mitchell
Senior Conservation Officer
Placemaking and Housing | Haringey Council

E-mail: Ruth1.mitchell@haringey.gov.uk
Alexandra House 10 Station Road, Wood Green, N22 7TR
www.haringey.gov.uk



Please note the above opinion represents informal officer opinion only, and does not prejudice to all future formal Council decisions and accompanying procedures.