

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2011/0628

Ward: Highgate

Date received: 01/04/2011

Last amended date: N/A

Drawing number of plans: 1624-PL-100; 101; 102; 103;104; 105; 106; 107

Address: 42 Stormont Road N6

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage wing and erection of part single, part two storey rear/side extensions with associated new roof including rear dormer (householder application)

Existing Use: Residential Dwelling

Proposed Use: Residential Dwelling

Applicant: Mr Russell Abrahams

Ownership: Private

PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Conservation Area

Road Network: B Road

Officer contact: Michelle Bradshaw

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site is located on the corner of Stormont Road and Denewood Road, N6 in the Highgate ward. The site is approximately 0.248 hectares (0.5 acres), being 69.50m long on the Denewood Road side, having a frontage of 31.50m and an oblique boundary to the rear. The site is orientated north-west to south-east. The site is bordered by 40 Stormont Road, 48 and 46 Sheldon Avenue and the private section of Denewood Road, which is separated from the house by a grass verge which forms part of the plot. The site is occupied by a two-storey detached inter-war house with rooms in the roof.

The existing house was erected in 1923/4 and was among the last of the houses to be built in the street. A number of extensions have taken place since this time which has slightly altered the original character. The principle alteration has been the enlargement of the former garage and nursery wing at the north east corner of the house, with a new two storey block projecting back into the garden. Other alterations include replacing some of the original timber windows on the main façade with u-pvc windows.

Stormont Road and Denewood Road are predominantly residential in character with relatively large properties set on substantial grounds. There is no prevailing architectural style in the area, being a mix of Georgian, mock Georgian, Victorian, Arts and Crafts, 20th Century and Contemporary designs. However there is a consistent palette of materials used in the locality including brick, clay tiled roofs and painted timber windows. The site is within the Bishops Sub-Area of Highgate Conservation Area.

PLANNING HISTORY

OLD/1976/1275 - Erection of garage & sun lounge & rebuilding of existing stores- Approved 12-11-76

HGY/2009/2090 - Demolition of existing family dwelling and erection of two storey dwelling with rooms in the roof – Refused – Appeal Dismissed (APP/Y5420/A/10/2125121/WF)

HGY/2009/2091 - Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing family dwelling and erection of two storey dwelling with rooms in the roof – Refused – Appeal Dismissed (APP/Y5420/E/10/2125122/WF)

HGY/2010/0859 - Demolition of existing family dwelling and erection of two storey dwelling with rooms in the roof – Withdrawn

HGY/2010/0868 - Conservation Area Consent for demolition of existing family dwelling and erection of two storey dwelling with rooms in the roof - Withdrawn

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

This application seeks planning permission for the demolition of existing garage wing and erection of part single, part two storey rear/side extensions with associated new roof including rear dormer. The area of demolition would include approximately 104 sq metres on the ground floor and 50.6 sq metres on the first floor of gross external floor space. The existing house has a gross internal floor area of 496m² (5339sq ft) and it is proposed to increase this by 241m² (2594sq ft) to a total of 737m² (7933sq ft).

Materials are to include: walls at ground floor level to be red brick with corbelling details to match the existing, external walls at first floor level to be painted render. Roof materials will include plain clay tiles to the pitched roof slopes and single ply membrane to the flat roof areas. All new doors and window are to be painted hardwood in a style to match the existing. Rainwater goods are to be cast iron to match the existing. Boundary treatment is to be closed board fencing and renewal of existing fencing. The existing vehicle access is tarmac and will remain as existing.

CONSULTATION

London Fire and Emergency Authority
Haringey Building Control
Haringey Conservation
Haringey Arboriculture and Allotments
Haringey Transportation
Haringey Waste Management

Ward Councillors
The Highgate Society
Highgate CAAC

36, 38, 40 Stormont Road, N6
39, 41, 43 Stormont Road, N6
44, 46, 48 Sheldon Avenue, N6
12 – 20 (e) Denewood Road, N6
Flat a, 14 Denewood Road, N6
19 Stormont Road, N6
46 Abbostahall Avenue N14 7JX
169 North Hill N6

RESPONSES

Haringey Conservation Officer –

No. 42 Stormont Road is located on a large corner site on the junction with Denewood Road, and lies within the Bishops Sub-Area of Highgate Conservation Area.

The current proposals for the demolition of the existing garage wing and for alterations and extensions of the existing house

It is significant to note how the proposed works leave the front elevation, the main structure, its roof form, and the layout of the original house substantially intact. The works of alteration and extension include the erection a part single, part two storey rear and side extensions with a matching roof form over including rear dormer.

In terms of relevant UDP Planning Policy, CSV1 requires development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, and CSV5 requires proposals for alterations and extensions in conservation areas to have due regard to Planning Guidance SPG2. Policy UD4 requires any proposals for development, alterations and extensions to be of a high design quality addressing criteria a) – m) of the policy.

Having studied the plans, inspected the site, the house and its setting I consider the proposed alterations, side and rear extensions are subordinate to the original house and respect its architectural character. It is apparent that due care has been taken to ensure that the alterations and extensions fit into the existing character and appearance of the house. They proposals do not upset the scale or proportion of the house, and do not adversely upset the character or setting of neighbouring buildings.

I therefore consider that the proposals are in compliance with planning policy and guidance.

I therefore recommend permission subject to a condition requiring detailed approval of all proposed facing materials.

Consultation Response 4 - Highgate CAAC – “Neighbours’ views should be considered in the view of the Highgate CAAC”.

Consultation Response 1 - 169 North Hill, N6 – Object

“This will increase the carbon foot print in the area dramatically and will increase both light pollution (from new roof) and substantially alter the structure of the house to the detriment of the environment. The agent does not even live there”.

Consultation Response 2, 7, 8 - 16 Denewood Road, N6 – Object

(Letter 1)

- Building up to the fence line with eaves over-hanging the fence would spoil the existing semi-rural feel. In this part of the conservation area almost all corner houses (28 Denewood, 43 Stormont, 43 Sheldon, 45 Sheldon, 4 Denewood) had been built well inside the fence line with a wide gap between the building and the fence. Allowing this would create a bad precedent and the character of the area would be lost.
- The proposed extension projects beyond the boundary into the grass verge which is subject to Rights of Way for others to pass with or without vehicles (Conveyance dated 4 Nov 1958). The grass verge is part of Denewood Road and cannot be built upon.
- The garage doors during its operation could cause injury to people walking along the grass verge. The garage door should be moved inside by at least one metre.
- The sense of openness at the junction of Denewood Road and Stormont Road is a strong component of the character of the area. Sentiment notes in Inspectors Report (paragraph 6).
- The garage would be extended towards Stormont Road and into the garden with a pitch roof all around would remove the sense of openness now existing at the junction.
- Permitting the garage to be extended into the garden would allow the applicant and/or future owner to extend the entire house into the garden under permitted development.

(Letter 2 – Duplicate of Letter 1)

(Letter 3)

- The mass and bulk of the proposed building became obvious on detailed examination of the plans
- The proposed building is even bigger than the one previously refused
- The design statement does not mention the 2m extension of the garage/stores on Denewood Road side towards Stormont Road and about 1.6m toward the garden. The extension would extend beyond the building line of number 40 Stormont Road.
- The extension at first floor level blocks the corner and reduces the openness and sense of space around the corner (refer to inspectors report)
- Eaves/gutters overhang onto the grass verge which has Rights of Way, is not acceptable in prominent corner location. It is illegal too and would cause obstruction to users of this grass verge. Applicant should be asked to move the wall well inside the boundary (fence)
- The balcony on the first floor level will be intrusive to some neighbours
- There are no windows on the first floor all towards Denewood Road at present. Of the additional windows two are for one bedroom which has four windows in all. These windows will overlook neighbouring properties and affect privacy.
- Planning permission was refused for demolition by the Planning Inspector as the existing house sits comfortably with neighbours houses. Proposal includes

demolition of substantial part of the existing house. Is it justified on the basis of the Inspectors decision?

- Opening the garage door towards Denewood Road will be unsafe for anyone walking on the verge.
- Refusal of the applicant to sign section 106 agreement as requested by Mr Shane of 40 Stormont Road is also of great concern.

Consultation Response 3 - 46 Abbotshall Avenue, N14 – Object

- Conservation Area - The proposal will not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area
- Bulk and Scale – The garage would be moved forward and backward with a large pitched roof in three directions, shifting the first floor facing walls towards Denewood and Stormont Road, raising some of the roof ridges. Percentage increase in floor area (and possibly volume) in the new proposal is higher than the percentage increase in floor area of the proposal rejected by the Planning Inspectorate
- The existing house had already been extended two times. Further additions and extensions would be an overdevelopment and will not fit with neighbouring houses
- Council should insist on having a gap of at least 1m on either side of the house without filling the whole width and third of the depth of the plot
- It appears the applicant is demolishing a large part of the building
- All other corner houses in this area would use a grant of planning permission as a precedent to fill their plots with bricks destroying the openness and greenery that exists in this area.
- This conservation area is in the fringes of Hampstead Heath

Consultation Response 5, 9 - 20 Denewood Road, N6 – Object

(Letter 1)

- Overdevelopment
- The proposal would have an environmental impact
- The proposal would affect the character and appearance of the area
- The design and appearance of the extension would not fit in with the rural appearance of the road
- Noise and disturbance due to the use of the garage
- Windows overlooking and facing houses on Denewood Road

(Letter 2)

- Overdevelopment – bulk and mass excessive, building beyond existing permitted boundary lines which is unacceptable and out of character with existing modest proportions of its neighbours
- The bulk and mass of the proposed building is now larger than the previous application which was turned down by yourselves

Consultation Response 6 – 18 Denewood Road, N6 – Object

- By extending out the garage into Stormont Road with a room above will close up the corner

- Any building of the two garages in Denewood Road that encroaches onto the grass should not be allowed.
- The balcony will overlook my neighbours garden
- Windows above the new pitched roof overlooking my neighbour in 16 Denewood Road – they should be removed
- Long extension of the pitched roof will look very massive after the flat roof

Consultation Response 10 - 22 Denewood Road, N6

1. Welcomes the proposal to keep the existing house. While a part of the house facing Denewood Road would be demolished and rebuilt, the main block of the house would be kept. The vast majority of the perimeter walls are to be retained and a significant number of internal walls would be preserved. Council should ask for a plan showing exactly which walls, both internal and external, would be kept before the proposal is considered by the Council.
2. The net internal floor area of the house would increase by 49% (to 7933 sq ft from 5339 sq ft for the existing house). This is a larger increase of 41% (to 7513 sq ft net internal floor area) of the previous proposal which was rejected by Haringey Planning Committee and by the Planning Inspector.
3. The plan to demolish and rebuild the wing and garage near Denewood Road (part of which dates from the original house) would lead to a significantly larger scale building that would be more dominant than might appear at first sight from looking at the plans. Extension toward Stormont Road by about 7 feet and toward the garden by about 5 feet. At first floor level toward Stormont Road by about 2 feet and up to 4 feet towards Denewood Road. Finally, the roof would be about 2 feet higher, though only approximate figures are given on the drawing.
4. Concerned about the ground floor extension adjacent to Denewood Road (and beyond the building line of number 42 and 40 Stormont Road). This would be particularly noticeable from Denewood Road and would interrupt existing view of trees across the gardens of Stormont Road. The ground floor extension would be directly adjacent to the grass verge (rather than set back in the garden) and there would be a pitched roof instead of a flat roof (though architecturally more appealing) would be much more noticeable in the semi-rural surroundings.
5. The house along the Denewood Road side should not be allowed to impinge upon the grass verge, which is subject to rights of way.
6. It is appreciated that the applicant and his architect consulted some neighbours before submitting the application. As a result a couple of changes were made – first the proposed terrace next to no. 40 Stormont Road at the back was lowered and second the proposed ground floor elevation along Denewood Road was brought in by a small amount, though the eaves and guttering would still overhang the grass verge.

Consultation Response 11, 12 - 40 Stormont Road, N6 (2 letters plus attachments)

(Letter 1)

- The revised new application is not materially different in terms of mass and size from the previous application.
- The proposed development would overlook the garden
- SPG2 states that “The Council will protect from demolition buildings and structures which make a positive contribution to the character of an area and which define its identity”.

- No certainty the applicant will reside at the property as a householder
- The applicant has refused to enter into a s106 agreement
- The case for demolition in a conservation area is not made out by the applicant. An increase in area of 2,595 sq ft amounts to a 67.30% increase in the current floor area (based on 5549 sq ft gross at a net to gross of 80%). This amounts to 9156 sq ft in total, substantially more than the 7,827 sq ft considered by the Inspector.
- The presumption against demolition in a conservation area is ignored by the developer.
- The proposed development is not in scale or in keeping with the neighbouring properties and constitutes an overdevelopment of the site.
- The applicant should be asked to provide a scale model showing how the development sits within the context of the neighbouring properties.
- The existing building and its fabric is substantial and not beyond repair and can be economically refurbished so as to preserve, conserve and enhance the entity of the conservation area.
- The construction of a large extension will alter the watercourses which run in the area
- The development will occupy the whole frontage thereby altering the pattern of development in the street. In particular, the applicant is seeking to build right up to the boundary on Denewood Road will alter the street scene dramatically.
- The development will extend the overall mass and bulk overshadowing neighbouring properties
- The first floor balcony overlooks the garden of number 40 Stormont Road.

Attachments to the letter include:

1. A copy of the Planning Inspectorate Appeal Decision (APP/Y5420/E/10/2125122/WF)
2. Incomplete Deed of Unilateral Undertaking made under Section 106 of Town and Country Planning Act 1990 relating to land at 42 Stormont Road, N6
3. Statement by Gary Jackson (Architect) on behalf of resident group against the appeal to the planning inspectorate in relation to 42 Stormont Road
4. Statement by Richard Culter (Green Park Consulting) on behalf of resident group against the appeal to the planning inspectorate in relation to 42 Stormont Road

(Letter 2 – Duplicate of Letter 1)

Consultation Response 13 - 8 Grange Road, N6

- Character Appraisal - The area is a very beautiful part of Haringey recognised by its protected status as a Conservation Area. The council is in the process of undertaking a character appraisal analysis. The area is under constant attack from developers whose overriding aim is to build as large as possible in every direction, reducing and removing the green spaces between and behind the properties in the process.
- The visual separation of the properties had defined the rhythm and pattern of development and attempts to impinge upon it must be resisted.
- Inspector comments on 6a Grange Road "...there remains a suburban openness around developments in this part of the conservation area that is strengthened by the presence of significant areas of open space". He went on to say "UDP policy UD3 requires development proposals to complement the character of the locality and this is reflected in UDP policy UD4, which highlights the importance of considering the spatial and visual character of the site and area".

- The draft character appraisal describes Grange Road as looking “like a road in the Countryside”. The Inspector ruling against the previous application agreed saying “The part of Denewood Road between Stormont Road and Sheldon Avenue has a particularly soft, semi-rural feel”.
- The current application – The style of the current application is an improvement on the previous proposals which would have looked far more at home on The Bishop’s Avenue than here. However, this does not mean that in the present form it is an acceptable proposition for this very important corner site on a unique open green space within a conservation area.
- Danger that overdevelopment of this site will have the same effect as houses at either end of Grange Road
- Although as commented by the Inspector, the garaging element of the existing house “is not particularly sympathetic”, the entirely flat roof only just above the fence line level, combined with the width of that roof, does give the effect of space and distance between the grass verge on Denewood Road and the built up walls of the house. This distance must be protected.
- The extension of the garage with a pitched roof has the effect of bringing the much larger house directly up to the verge and creating an overbearing bulky form above it. The proposed building would no longer “...politely respect its prominent corner position because of the set back of the main two storey element from Denewood Road frontage”.
- This design brings the much larger elements directly to the verge on all levels (we note the raised roof ridges to accommodate the extended depth of the second floor) and as a result the ‘sense of space around the junction, which adds to the relatively soft urban grain along this part of Denewood Road’ will be lost.
- Previous commentators have mentioned that the proposed roof will also overhang the green area. On no account should any intrusion upon this precious verge be sanctioned.
- The appearance of the verge area would be improved by the erection of continuous fencing along the ground floor wall adjacent to the verge with a gap for the garage entrance.
- Enforcement – The existing site plan has distances and sizes marked upon it, this is not the case for the proposed plan. Other drawings show only basic measurements. This makes it impossible to be able to assess how large the finished building will be. Grange Road properties have ended up much larger than the submitted application drawings indicate.
- Amenity and Overlooking – The proposal would bring the first and second floor rear windows and a new first floor balcony (without privacy screens) much closer to the rear garden of No. 40 thus increasing the possibility of overlooking to that garden.

Officers Comments: The material planning issues raised by residents have been taken into consideration in the assessment of this application.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Planning Guidance

PPS1	Delivering Sustainable Development (2005)
PPS3	Housing (November 2006 and April 2007)
PPS5	Planning for the Historic Environment

The London Plan (February 2008) (Consolidated with Amendments since 2004)

The London Plan (Consultation Draft Replacement Plan (October 2009)

London Housing Design Guide (August 2010)

Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006)

UD2	Sustainable Design and Construction
UD3	General Principles
UD4	Quality Design
UD7	Waste Storage
CSV1	Development in Conservation Areas
CSV5	Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas
CSV7	Demolition in Conservation Areas
OS17	Tree Protection, Tree Masses and Spines

Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2006)

SPG1a	Design Guidance (Adopted 2006)
SPG2	Conservation and Archaeology
SPG8a	Waste and Recycling (Adopted 2006)
SPG8b	Materials
SPG8c	Environmental Performance
SPD	Housing

Local Development Framework

Core Strategy Proposed Submission (May 2010)

Draft Development Management Policies (May 2010)

Draft Sustainable Design and Construction SPD (October 2010)

ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

The following issues will be discussed in the assessment report below: (1) Demolition, Conservation and Design Issues; (2) Amenity of Neighbours; (3) Trees and Landscaping; (4) Sustainability, Parking/Access, Waste Management.

1. Demolition, Conservation and Design Issues

This application follows a previous planning application (HGY/2009/2090) and Conservation Area consent (HGY/2009/2091) for the demolition of the existing family dwelling (two storey with rooms in the roof) and the erection of a two storey dwelling with rooms in the roof. These applications were refused by Haringey Planning Committee and a subsequent appeal dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate (Ref: APP/Y5420/A/10/2125121/WF and APP/Y5420/E/10/2125122/WF).

Policies PPS5, CSV7 and SPG2 resist the demolition of existing buildings where they make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. While Haringey Conservation and Planning Officers considered that the existing dwelling provides a neutral contribution to the conservation area the Planning Inspector was of the view that the existing dwelling provides a positive contribution to the conservation area and therefore weighs in favour of retention. As such, this application proposes to retain the existing dwelling house, unlike the previous application which proposed complete demolition and a new build construction.

The demolition proposed in this application is limited to the garage wing to the northern side of the site. The area of demolition would include approximately 104 sq metres on the ground floor and 50.6 sq metres on the first floor of gross external floor space. Given that the total gross external floor area of the existing dwelling is 545.76 sq metres (496sq m of internal floor space) this amount of demolition is not considered to be substantial. The Design and Access Statement, page 13, provides the proposed plans with the plans of the existing dwelling overlaid and clearly shows the walls to be retained (shown in red). From this plan it is evident that the vast majority of the external structure is to be retained. The front façade (except for the garage wing) would remain almost exactly as existing. Similarly, the existing southern wall, closest to 40 Stormont Road, is to remain unaltered. The rear wall is also to be retained, forming an internal partition wall within the proposed extension. As such, the vast majority of the existing external structure remains unchanged from the existing arrangement.

The decision of the House of Lords in *Shimizu (UK) Ltd v Westminster City Council* (1997) is relevant here. Their Lordship held that ‘demolition’ means the demolition of all or nearly all of a listed building. Anything less is considered to be an ‘alteration’. This decision also means that conservation area consent which is required for ‘demolition’ of a building in a conservation area will now only be required when all or nearly all of the building is to be demolished, anything less would not require conservation area consent. This decision is reflected in the Environmental Circular 14/97, “Planning and the Historic Environment – Notification and Directions by the Secretary of State”. This application, as outlined above does not propose to demolish all or nearly all of the building and as such, conservation area consent is not required and the works are deemed to be an ‘alteration’ assessable under a full (householder) planning application.

The main issue under consideration in this application is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. PPS5 Objective HE7.5 states that Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use. Policies UD3, UD4 and SPG1a require new developments to be of a high standard of design using good quality materials. In particular, they should respect the rhythm, form and massing, the height and scale and the historic heritage context of the site. The spatial and visual character of the development site and the surrounding area/street scene should be taken into consideration in the design of developments. Policy CSV1, CSV5 and SPG2 require developments in conservation areas to preserve and enhance the character of the locality.

In addition to the partial demolition works, described above, the application proposes to alter and extend the existing property. It would include the erection of a part single, part two storey rear/side extension and works to create a new roof form including a rear dormer. Materials are to include red brick with corbelling details to match the existing for the external walls at ground floor level and painted render to the walls at first floor level. Roof materials will include plain clay tiles to the pitched roof slopes and single ply membrane to the flat roof areas. All new windows are to be painted hardwood in a style to match the existing all new doors will also be painted hardwood. Rainwater goods are to be cast iron to match the existing. Boundary treatment is to be closed board fencing and also include the renewal of existing fencing. The existing vehicle access is tarmac and will remain as existing. Notwithstanding the details provided, a condition of consent will require full details of materials, including samples, to be submitted and approved prior to construction.

The extension at the rear would be a two storey extension and in effect partially infill the gap between the northern wing and the existing main house. The extension would be 6.0m deep at ground floor level, 4.40m deep at first floor level and 13.8m wide. A balcony 1.50m deep and 3.0m wide would be centrally located at first floor level. The proposed extension would occupy an area to the rear largely concealed from public view from Denewood Road by the proposed northern wing. The extension would not project beyond the rear building line of the northern wing of 40 Stormont Road as shown on the "Proposed Site Plan" (1624-PL0103). The gap between 40 Stormont road and 42 Stormont Road will remain unchanged. As such the resulting development will have similar building lines to adjacent residential properties, in keeping with the character of the area.

In terms of the roof works the ridge height would not exceed that of the existing house. From Stormont Road the only discernable difference to the roof would be the new pitched roof to the single storey section of the northern wing. From Denewood Road the roofline of the rear extension would be visible above the northern wing and again the pitched roof of the single storey side extension. However, the staggered roof line will break up the appearance and be set back from the boundary and thus retain appropriate proportions on this corner. The addition roofline to the southern elevation would not be overly prominent from Stormont Road due to the two storey wing of the neighbouring property at number 40 Stormont Road. In terms of the rear dormer it would be 3.0m wide and 1.95m high and thus retain subordination to the rear roof slope.

The single storey extension adjacent to Denewood Road would extend an additional 2.055m greater than the existing building towards Stormont Road. A set back of 3.0m would be maintained from the main front elevation of the dwelling. The single storey side extension would extend back into the garden by approximately 1.575m greater than the existing building. Therefore the total length of the single storey side extension would be 15.62m which is 3.92m greater than the existing wall. It should also be noted that the proposed wall along the Denewood road boundary would be set in marginally (150mm) compared to the existing wall (page 13 of the Design and Access statement provides a comparison of the existing and proposed).

A number of residents raise concern about encroachment of the proposed building and the overhang of gutters and eaves of the grass verge which they claim have "Rights of Way". The agents working on behalf of the applicant have advised that the grass verge is in the ownership of the applicant and therefore this issue of encroachment raised by residents is not a material planning consideration. Similarly, they raise concern about the proposed garage door fronting Denewood Road. However, the new garage door will be in the same

location as the existing garage door though set further into the site by 150mm thus having slightly less impact than the existing garage door arrangement.

At first floor level the extension is only slightly larger than the existing first floor wing in the same location. The extension would be 700mm longer than existing toward Stormont Road, maintaining a set back of 4.6m from the main front elevation of the dwelling. The side wall of the first floor extension would be between 650mm and 1.10m closer to the Denewood Road boundary, maintaining a set back of 3.80m from the boundary. The rear wall of the first floor would be on the same line as the existing wing. As such, the proposed first floor extension is slightly larger than the existing first floor extension and therefore not considered to have a significantly different impact than the current situation.

The existing single storey building adjacent to Denewood Road has a flat roof along the entire length. The Planning Inspector noted in the Appeal Decision report that “the house has been extended in the past and the garaging element in particular, is not particularly sympathetic”. The proposed plans seek to soften and improve this unsympathetic element by creating a pitched roof to the new single storey wing.

As previously noted, the main issue under consideration in this application is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area. The Planning Inspector described the immediate locality of Denewood Road, between Stormont Road and Sheldon Avenue (mistakenly called Sheldon Road in the appeal decision) as having “a particularly soft, semi-rural feel, imparted by the wide grass verge, mature trees, including the ancient oak tree standing in the road, as well as the lack of a hard built up frontage in the vicinity”. While the proposed extension is slightly larger than the existing (as described in detail above) it is not considered to be unduly large in relation to the extent of the plot or the length of Denewood Road between the two junctions. It is considered that the proposed development respects the important prominent corner position and would not significantly detract from the openness of the corner. The Haringey Conservation Officer also confirms this in their comments as follows: “Having studied the plans, inspected the site, the house and its setting I consider the proposed alterations, side and rear extensions are subordinate to the original house and respect its architectural character. It is apparent that due care has been taken to ensure that the alterations and extensions fit into the existing character and appearance of the house. The proposals do not upset the scale or proportion of the house, and do not adversely upset the character or setting of neighbouring buildings. I therefore consider that the proposals are in compliance with planning policy and guidance”.

While the extensions will result in a dwelling of an increased footprint compared to the current arrangement the proposed extensions to the existing dwelling would sit comfortably within the context of the plot size and be located to have minimal visual impact from the public realm. The mass, scale and overall design quality would be similar to dwellings within the immediate vicinity. Overall, the proposed design in terms of bulk and mass, detailing, colours and materials are considered to be of a high quality appropriate to the locality and in keeping with the character of the conservation area. Overall, the proposed alterations and extensions would preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, in accordance with the advice at PPS 5, UDP policies UD3, UD4, CSV1, CSV5 and Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1a and SPG2.

2. Amenity of Neighbours

Policy UD3 and SPD Housing state that the Council will require development proposals to demonstrate that there are no significant adverse impacts on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy, overlooking and aspect along with the avoidance of air, water, light and noise pollution, smell or nuisance.

A number of residents on the opposite side of Denewood Road are concerned about overlooking. This was also a point raised by residents at the time of the last scheme and dismissed by the Planning Inspector who states "...given the available separation distance between the appeal site and those properties, I am satisfied that the proposal would not cause significant harm in these regards". This argument remains valid in this case. While there are three windows proposed in the side extension at first floor level (one to a bathroom and two to a bedroom) the distance between these windows and the nearest residential property on Denewood Road is approximately 26.30m and therefore no significant harm would result. The neighbour at 40 Stormont Road has also raised concern about overlooking and overshadowing. However the rear extension would not project beyond the existing two storey rear projection of number 40 and due to the orientation of the proposal site being to the north of this neighbour the development would not cause any appreciable loss of light or overshadowing. In terms of overlooking the proposed balcony at first floor level would be set in from the shared boundary by approximately 7m and a further metre away from the nearest point of the next door building. Any views would be at an acute angle and at some distance and therefore would not give rise to a material loss of privacy to the occupants. Notwithstanding this, a condition of consent will be imposed removing permitted development rights from the site in order to ensure any further extensions or significant alterations are subject to planning control.

The location and design of the proposed extensions and alterations have given due consideration to the amenity of nearby residential properties and would not result in any significant detrimental harm to the amenity currently experienced by any adjacent neighbour. Overall, the application is considered to be in line with policy UD3 and SPD Housing.

3. Trees and Landscaping

Policy OS17 and SPG8d seek to protect and improve the contribution of trees, tree masses and spines to local landscape character. The plans show that the rear garden will be landscaped and the 'Proposed Site Plan' includes a planting schedule. This plan also indicates that the existing trees on site are to be retained. New planting along the southern boundary and front forecourt is also proposed. Conditions of consent will require the landscaping works to be implemented in accordance with the submitted plans, that no trees shall be lopped, felled or otherwise affected without approval from the local planning authority and that an Arboricultural method statement, including a tree protection plan, shall be prepared and implemented during construction. Overall, the development is considered to comply with policy OS17 and SPG8d.

4. Sustainability, Access/Parking and Waste Management

Policy UD2 requires sustainable design and construction to form an integral part of any scheme. In addition, the Council will seek that development schemes take into account, where feasible, the environmentally friendly materials, energy efficiency, renewable energy, water conservation, recycling and sustainable urban drainage systems (SUDS). The

proposal seeks to refurbish an existing building in line with current building standards which will ensure a much higher level of sustainability and energy efficiency than the existing dwelling. Overall, the development is considered to be acceptable in terms of sustainability in line with the London Plan and policy UD2 and SPG8c.

The access arrangements remain unchanged with the pedestrian and vehicles access from Stormont Road unaltered and the retention of the existing vehicular access from Denewood Road. A number of residents have raised concern about the garage door to Denewood Road however this is in exactly the same location as the existing driveway and garage door (albeit set into the site a further 150mm) and thus is not considered to result in a situation different to that which is currently existing.

Policy UD7 and SPG8a require development to include adequate provision for the storage and collection of waste and recyclable material. The development consists of a 6 bedroom house, this property will therefore require a storage area of sufficient size to contain 1 x 360 litre refuse bin, 1 x 240 litre refuse bin, 2 x green recycling boxes, 1 x organic waste caddy and 1 x garden caddy and 1 x garden waste bag. A condition of consent will require full details of the refuse storage area and an informative will set out the precise storage requirements as listed above. Overall the scheme is considered to be in line with policy UD7 and SPG8a.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The overall design is considered to be of a high quality complementing the existing dwelling and surrounding development. The proposed extensions and alterations to the existing dwelling would sit comfortably within the context of the plot size and be located to have minimal visual impact from the public realm. The mass, scale and overall design quality would be similar to dwellings within the immediate vicinity. Overall, the proposed design in terms of bulk and mass, detailing, colours and materials are considered to be of a high quality appropriate to the locality and in keeping with the character of the conservation area. The proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents. The development is found to be in line with the intent of National, Regional and Local Planning Policies including policy UD1 'Planning Statements', UD2 'Sustainable Design and Construction', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', UD7 'Waste Storage' CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas', CSV7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas', OS17 'Tree Protection, Tree Masses and Spines' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006) and SPG1a 'Design Guidance', SPG2 'Conservation and Archaeology', SPG8b 'Materials', SPG8c 'Environmental Performance', SPG8d 'Biodiversity, Landscaping & Trees' and SPD 'Housing' of the Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2006). On this basis, it is recommended that planning permission be GRANTED subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

Registered No: HGY/2011/0628

Applicant's drawing No's: 1624-PL-100; 101; 102; 103;104; 105; 106; 107

Subject to the following conditions:

IMPLEMENTATION

1. The development hereby authorised must be begun not later than the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of the provisions of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

2. The development hereby authorised shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

EXTERNAL APPEARANCE

3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no construction shall be commenced until precise details and samples of the materials to be used in connection with the development hereby permitted have been submitted to, approved in writing by and implemented in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority. Samples should include sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references.

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the exact materials to be used for the proposed development and to assess the suitability of the samples submitted in the interests of visual amenity.

TREES, LANDSCAPING AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT

4. The landscaping shall be carried out in complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

5. The existing trees on the site shall not be lopped, felled or otherwise affected in any way (including raising and lowering soil levels under the crown spread of the trees) and no excavation shall be cut under the crown spread of the trees without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the trees in the interest of visual amenity of the area.

6. Before any works herein permitted are commenced, all those trees to be retained, as indicated on the approved drawings, shall be protected by secure, stout, exclusion fencing erected at a minimum distance equivalent to the branch spread of the trees and in accordance with BS 5837:2005 and to a suitable height. Any works connected with the approved scheme within the branch spread of the trees shall be by hand only. No storage of materials, supplies or plant machinery shall be stored, parked, or allowed access beneath the branch spread of the trees or within the exclusion fencing.

Reason: In order to ensure the safety and well being of the trees on the site during constructional works that are to remain after building works are completed.

7. An Arboricultural method statement, including a tree protection plan, must be prepared in accordance with BS5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction, for approval by the Council. A pre-commencement site meeting must be specified and attended by all interested parties, (Site manager, Consultant Arboriculturalist, Council Arboriculturalist and Contractors) to confirm all the protection measures to be installed for trees. Robust protective fencing / ground protection must be installed prior to commencement of construction activities on site and retained until completion. It must be designed and installed as recommended in the method statement. The protective fencing must be inspected by the Council Arboriculturalist, prior to any works commencing on site and remain in place until works are complete.

Reason: To ensure the adequate protection to trees on the site and adjacent sites.

8. Notwithstanding the details contained within the plans hereby approved, full details of boundary treatments, including fencing and gates, to the entire site be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development.

Reason: In order to safeguard the visual amenity of the area and to ensure adequate means of enclosure for the proposed development.

WASTE MANAGMENT

9. A detailed scheme for the provision of refuse, waste storage and recycling within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the works. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of the locality.

RESTRICTION OF USE/FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

10. The development hereby approved shall be used as a single dwelling i.e. one residential unit and shall not at any time be occupied separately as more than one residential unit.

Reason: The sub-division of the property would result in the provision of two units of accommodation, out of keeping with the pattern of development in the locality.

11. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended) (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development otherwise permitted by any part of Class A, B, D & E of Part 1 to Schedule 2 of that Order shall be carried out on site.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and the general locality

CONSTRUCTION

12. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.

INFORMATIVE: The development will require a storage area of sufficient size to contain 1 x 360 litre refuse bin, 1 x 240 litre refuse bin, 2 x green recycling boxes, 1 x organic waste caddy and 1 x garden caddy and 1 x garden waste bag.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The reasons for the grant of planning permission are as follows:

(a) The proposal is acceptable for the following reasons:

- I. The design, form, detailing and facing materials are considered acceptable;
- II. The proposal will preserve the character of the conservation area
- III. The development will not have any significant adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours
- IV. The scheme has been designed sensitively in terms of environmental and sustainability issues

(b) The proposal has been assessed against and found to comply with the intent of National, Regional and Local Planning Policies including policy PPS5 'Planning for the Historic Environment', UDP Policies: UD1 'Planning Statements', UD2 'Sustainable Design and Construction', UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', UD7 'Waste Storage', CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas', CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas' CSV7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas' and OS17 'Tree Protection, Tree Masses and Spines of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (2006) and SPG1a 'Design Guidance', SPG2 'Conservation and Archaeology', SPG8a 'Waste and Recycling (Adopted 2006)', SPG8b 'Materials', SPG8c 'Environmental Performance' and SPD 'Housing' of the Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (October 2006).

Site Plan



Comparison Plans – Existing and Proposed Overlaid (Retained Walls shown in Red)



Existing Elevations



Eastern (Front) Elevation – Stormont Road



Western (Rear) Elevation



Northern (Side) Elevation – Denewood Road

Proposed Elevation Plans

Prepared by: [Name] | Date: [Date]



EAST ELEVATION STREET VIEW

Eastern (Front) Elevation – Stormont Road



WEST ELEVATION

Western (Rear) Elevation



SOUTH ELEVATION

NORTH ELEVATION

Southern (Side) Elevation – Adjacent to 40 Stormont Road Northern (Side) Elevation – Denewood Road