



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2024/0605
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	27 and 27a , Talbot Road, N6 4QS
Proposal:	Joint planning consent for the extension and refurbishment of 27 Talbot Road and the refurbishment of 27A Talbot Road including a new access staircase to the front of the property, ground floor rear extension and alteration to the existing roof terrace balustrade
Case Officer:	Gareth Prosser
Valid Date:	06/03/2024
Applicant:	Banks
Agent:	Mr Ben Ridley

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a red brick, terrace dwelling featuring a tall mansard roof, wide dormers and decorative plasterwork on the front facade. The building has been divided into two, self-contained flats. The property is located within the Highgate Conservation Area, though it is not a listed structure.

The site falls within Sub-area 3 - Archway of the conservation area, distinguished by 2-3 storey substantial houses, typically terraced or semi-detached, constructed in red brick with bay windows and red clay tiled roofs. Architectural details encompass porches, stuccoed parapets, rendered quoins, string courses, door chasing, and decorated ridge tiles.

Talbot Road consists primarily of substantial 2 or 3-storey Edwardian houses, usually with five or more bedrooms. These houses are predominantly constructed using red brick, with white window and door surrounds. They are arranged in small terraces or semi-detached configurations, featuring front gardens enclosed by low walls or fences.

According to the Highgate Conservation Area's Character Appraisal and Management Plan, Talbot Road was originally developed on Church Commissioner land between 1905 and 1908. The houses in this area exhibit a non-uniform architectural style, showcasing individual design features chosen by the original purchasers, including the presence of gable windows in the roof space. This architectural diversity includes the use of pantiles, pebble dash, and mock Tudor beams in varying combinations.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The proposed is for a joint planning consent for the extension and refurbishment of 27 Talbot Road and the refurbishment of 27A Talbot Road including a new access staircase to the front of the property.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/2020/0812 Full planning permission Approve with Conditions - 27 & 27a, Talbot Road, London, N6 4QS - Amalgamation of 27 and 27a Talbot Road to reinstate property as single dwelling house; associated removal of external access stairs and first floor access door on front/side elevations.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

- LBH Conservation Officer: The exiting extension is not of any intrinsic architectural merit, there is no objection to its replacement. The overall volume of the rear extension and its height is broadly similar to the existing, its design is slightly unusual for the host building but due to its restricted depth would not dominate the host dwelling. The alteration to the existing front staircase and its replacement is considered acceptable, given that the staircase is already in situ. Neither the design and access statement nor the plans or application form states what the materials would be for the front elevation staircase and appropriate materials should be subject to a condition for further details. Subject to this condition, conservation would support the application.

Local amenity groups

The following local groups/societies made representations:

Neighbour Consultation

The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses 1

Objecting 1

Support 0

Neither 0

The following issues were raised in representations and are addressed further on in this report or below:

- Picture windows out of character
- Limestone wall and stone spout out of character

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & appearance

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD both aim to enhance the built environment through high quality design that respects local context and positive aspects of the area. Policy DM1 sets out that development should relate positively to its locality in terms of building height, form, scale, massing, building lines and architectural details and styles.

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 and 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 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, The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

The existing extension is not of any intrinsic architectural merit; officers therefore have no objection to its replacement. The Conservation Officer has reviewed the proposed stating that, 'the overall volume of the rear extension and its height is broadly similar to the existing, its design is slightly unusual for the host building but due to its restricted depth would not dominate the host dwelling'.

The officer further states that 'The alteration to the existing front staircase and its replacement is considered acceptable, given that the staircase is already in situ. Neither the design and access statement nor the plans or application form states what the materials would be for the front elevation staircase'. Plans have been amended to clarify the proposed materials (blackened steel and York stone) which are considered acceptable.

Officers agree, given the location of the proposal to the rear and given that the most significant changes are located on the ground floor, in design and character terms, the proposal is acceptable being simple and contemporary and complementing, rather than emulating the original architecture of the host building. This approach is acceptable, particularly as there is no impact to the streetscene. Whilst, the proposed picture windows are larger, this is not unique and given the simple and uncluttered approach to the design, these are not considered to detract from the attractive Edwardian façade, the most significant of which is the front elevation.

A replacement balustrade is also proposed to the existing rear terrace. The terrace appears on previous applications at the site and is believed to date from the 1970's where the erection of a 'one 2 storey & one storey rear extension.' was granted permission ([OLD/1972/1430](#)). As such the terrace is long established. The proposed, simpler and more contemporary balustrade is considered an enhancement to the existing property, being more neutral in appearance and is considered acceptable.

To the front, the proposed changes to the staircase are acceptable, with the proposed materials considered to significantly enhance the appearance of the staircase. The proposed replacement windows match the original in terms of character and are acceptable.

In summary, the extension would be finished in materials to match those of the existing dwelling. The scheme here does not seek to replicate the existing design of the host property, but rather seeks to extend the property in a contemporary manner, an approach which is acceptable.

The proposal is considered proportionate and subordinate to the host building and would not negatively impact the amenity of the site, or adjoining properties. Therefore, the local character and visual amenity of the Highgate Conservation area would be protected.

The proposal would comply with Policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan 2017 and would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would be acceptable in heritage terms.

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.

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 the amenity of neighbouring residents.

As stated above, the overall volume of the rear extension and its height is broadly similar to the existing and therefore the height and depth of the rear extension would not adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring properties.

As such, the proposal is considered in accordance with the above policies.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed development is in in accordance with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017, and policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also does accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

The proposal is considered acceptable in respect of its character, appearance and impact on the site and would not result in material harm to the residential amenity of neighbours. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions.

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Informatives:**INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work**

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday

8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.