



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0623
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	2 De Quincey Road, Tottenham, London, N17 7DL
Proposal:	The installation of 125mm deep External Wall Insulation (EWI) enhancing both tenant comfort and thermal efficiency in line with Building Regulations Approved Document L, as well as protecting and improving the general condition of the building's fabric (amended description)
Case Officer:	Nathan Keyte
Valid Date:	28/03/2024
Applicant:	Mr Chris Creatorex
Agent:	Miss Sasha Ellam-Brown

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Proposed development

This is an application for external wall insulation (EWI). The proposal is for an external brick slip design, of a depth of 125mm.

2. Site and Surroundings

The application property is a two storey end of terrace corner dwelling house, and is a corner site on De Quincey Road and Risley Ave.

The building is not a listed building, however is located within the Rookfield Conservation Area.

Article 4 Directions applies to the site, including removing permitted development for alterations to the building.

No visit was carried out, with the assessment relying on photos provided with the application and publicly available imagery.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

None.

3. Consultation

Rookfield Estate CAAC: no comment received.

LBH Conservation Officer: Objects to the application, identifying less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area resulting from the proposal.

4. Local representations

The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site, letters and public notices.

There were no representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design and heritage

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.

The subject site is located within an Article 4 area, which precludes changes to the external appearance of the buildings in the area, and supports the desire to avoid harmful changes to the character of the conservation area from being introduced.

The proposal would result in the installation of an external slip brick system, introducing a change to the conservation area of Rookfield. Consistency in the brickwork and high quality detailing are important aspects of the conservation areas character and appearance. The slip brick system would result in the loss of original detailing of the brick, with any replacement brick slip unlikely to suitably replicate the existing brick variations and bonding pattern. This, along with the increase in wall thickness, and the prominence of the building on a corner site within the Conservation Area, would have a noticeable effect and detract from the character of the conservation area resulting in less than substantial harm.

Furthermore, in systems such as those proposed, there would be flow on impacts upon the consistency of lintels, cills and door surrounds, including terracotta tile cills and lintels which are important elements of detailing.

For the reasons outlined above, the proposal is not supported from a Conservation perspective, and would result in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area.

Paragraph 205 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

Paragraph 208 of the NPPF states that where a development proposal will 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 including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.

In the case of the current application, noting the less than substantial harm identified by the proposal, this is to be weighed up against the public benefit of the proposal. While the benefit of improving the efficiency of housing stock is acknowledged, noting in this case the application relates to a single dwelling, the benefit to the wider public would not be so great as to outweigh the harm on the heritage asset.

Conclusion

The proposal is not considered acceptable. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

6. Recommendation

REFUSE PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed external cladding, by reason of its design and appearance, would appear an incongruous and unsympathetic form of development, at odds with the character and appearance of the existing building and the terrace of which it forms a part, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Tower Gardens Estate Conservation Area. The public benefit arising from the proposed development is not considered sufficient to outweigh the resulting harm to heritage assets. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to policies DM1, DM9, and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017, and to Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.