

## **REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Reference No:** HGY/2007/1651

**Ward:** Crouch End

**Date received:** 07/08/2007

**Last amended date:** November 2007

**Drawing number of plans:** 100, 101 Rev A , 102 Rev A.

**Address:** Jameson Lodge, 58 Shepherds Hill N6

**Proposal:** Construction of extension at roof level creating additional floor comprising 1 x one bed and 1 x three bed self-contained flats.

**Existing Use:** Residential

**Proposed Use:** Residential

**Applicant:** Paul & Morris Peljord C/O Michael Smith

**Ownership:** Private

### **PLANNING DESIGNATIONS**

Road Network: Classified Road

**Officer Contact:** Stuart Cooke

### **RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The application site comprises the block of flats known as Jameson Lodge, 58 Shepherds Hill on the south side of Shepherds Hill N6. It is located within the Crouch End Conservation Area.

Jameson Lodge is located between Panorama Court, a modern block of flats, and No. 60 Shepherds Hill, a Victorian gothic style building subdivided into four flats. The block was built in the 1960s and consists of 11 self contained flats. Due to the steep slope of the site the building is three storeys high at the front and four storeys at the rear. To the rear of the site is a large garden ancillary to the block with garages at the rear and to the front of the site is a large parking area.

### **PLANNING HISTORY**

Planning permission was granted on the 23 May 1963 for the erection of blocks of flats (29 habitable rooms and 11 garages subsequently approved), HGY1963/0821.

Planning permission was refused on 5 July 2005 for the erection of an additional floor at roof level to comprise 3 additional self contained flats, HGY2005/0890. This application was subsequently dismissed on appeal in April 2006 on the grounds of visual intrusion to the top floor flats in Panorama Court and overlooking of the top floor balconies of Jameson Court and Panorama Court.

Planning permission was refused on the 25 October 2005 for the creation of additional floor at roof level to comprise 3 additional self contained flats, HGY2005/1638.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

This proposal seeks an additional floor at roof level comprising 1 x 1-bed and 1 x 3-bed self-contained flats. The proposed addition is largely glazed to the front and cedar clad to the sides. The one bed unit will be provided to the front and the three bed to the rear. The proposed addition is set back from the existing building parapets by approximately 1 metre at the front east side. However, the west side is set back further, approximately 4.7 metres at the rear of the block, in order to avoid overshadowing of the adjacent flats in Panorama Court. None of the areas of the flat roof remaining will be accessible from the flats.

The applicant has amended the appearance of the front elevation to give a lighter and more open appearance in the light of the comments made by the Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

Two previous schemes have been refused for this development, one of which has been dismissed on appeal. This current scheme takes into account the issues raised by the Inspector in his appeal decision, principally visual intrusion and overlooking.

## **CONSULTATION**

Ward Councillors  
Transportation  
Cleansing  
Building Control

Hornsey Conservation Area Advisory Committee  
Conservation team

Flats 1 - 11 Jameson Lodge

Flats 1 - 16 Panorama Court  
Flats 1 - 4, 60 Shepherds Hill  
71 - 75, 60, 62 Shepherds Hill

## **RESPONSES**

Transportation – no objection

Hornsey Conservation Area Advisory Committee –

*“We do not object to the massing, but the appearance of the additional floor should be lighter, more open, and a contrast to the remainder of the building.”*

Conservation Team – no objection in principle, design could be improved.

Eight objections have been received from local residents, from flats 5 and 9 Jameson Lodge, from flats 3, 13 and 15 Panorama Court, from flats 1 and 4, 60 Shepherds Hill and from No.62 Shepherds Hill.

The main issues raised by local residents are:

- Height / appearance – concern has been expressed that the addition of another floor will make the building too big.
- Affect on the conservation area - some residents expressed concern that the proposed additional floor will have an adverse effect on the conservation area.
- Loss of amenity – residents in Jameson Court, Panorama Court and No. 60 adjacent express concern that the proposal will result in additional loss of light, overlooking and loss of privacy to their properties.
- Parking - some residents express concern that the proposed development will result in excessive additional traffic and parking pressures in the area.

## **RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**

The Council's new Unitary Development Plan was adopted by the Council in July 2006 following its Public Inquiry and modifications procedures. It complies with relevant national policy guidance and the London Plan. The principal policies which are relevant to this case area set out below.

CSV5: Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas

UD3: General Principles

UD4: Quality Design

## **ANALYSIS / ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION**

The main issues to be considered in this case are:

- Size / bulk / appearance
- Effect on the conservation area
- Overlooking / visual intrusion

### Size / bulk / appearance

Policies UD3 and UD4 seek to ensure that new development complements the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale, bulk and appearance and is generally appropriate to the location. In terms of streetscape, Jameson Lodge is one of a number of modern blocks of flats in this part of Shepherds Hill. It comprises a 3-storey building to the front, of 11 flats. Panorama Court to the west is a four storey block of 16 flats. Due to the level change in Shepherds Hill, Panorama Court is higher than Jameson Lodge. The roof line of the proposed additional floor is therefore lower than the existing roof line of Panorama Court. Given that most of the blocks in Shepherds Hill are four storeys or more, the additional floor to Jameson Court is considered to be appropriate for the location.

The proposed additional floor is also set back one metre from the front elevation and between 2 metres and 4.5 metres from the sides. The setback will help to minimise the additional bulk of the structure from the street and will retain the original proportions of the block.

In terms of design and appearance, the applicant has amended the appearance of the front elevation to give a lighter and more open appearance. The additional floor is proposed as a lightweight structure, fully glazed to the front elevation, and timber clad to the sides. The design and materials are intended to reduce the visual impact on the street scene to a minimum. Also, the contrast in styles and materials of the proposal to the original building which is clearly subservient to the original building whilst being in contrast with it. The proposal is therefore considered to meet the requirements of policies UD3 and UD4 in terms of size bulk and appearance.

### Effect on the conservation area

Policy CSV5 seeks to ensure that extensions and alterations to existing buildings in conservation area do not cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. In this case, it is considered the proposed addition is of an appropriate size and bulk in relation to the original block and is set back from the edges of the block to retain its original shape and appearance. Also, it will not result in excessive height relative to other similar blocks in the surrounding area. In terms of design and appearance, the proposed addition is considered to be appropriate to the existing building in that the structure has clean modern lines in lightweight, contrasting materials appropriate to the location. The Conservation Area Advisory Committee have commented that they consider the massing of the additional floor to be acceptable, but the appearance should be lighter and more open,

in contrast to the remainder of the building. The applicant has amended the appearance of the front elevation to give a lighter and more open appearance.

The proposal is therefore considered not to detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area and complies with policy CSV5.

### Overlooking / visual intrusion

In his decision letter of April 2006 relating to the previous application, the Inspector considered that that proposal was too close to the side kitchen windows of the top floor flat in Panorama Court and would appear visually intrusive. In order to address this issue, the proposed structure has been moved away from the side of Jameson Lodge closest to Panorama Court by approximately 4.5 metres, to be in line with the existing water tank on the roof of Jameson Lodge. This means there is a gap of approximately 9.5 metres between the proposed structure and the side windows in Panorama Court which is considered sufficient to overcome any issues of visual intrusion or loss of light of aspect to these windows in Panorama Court.

The Inspector also considered that the top floor balconies of Jameson Lodge and Panorama Court would be overlooked from the roof area outside the proposed flats. None of the flats proposed in this application have access to the roof area and no terraces or balconies are included in the scheme. A condition is also attached to prevent the flat roof areas from being used as terraces. In addition, there are no windows in the side elevations to the proposed additional floor to avoid overlooking.

In the light of the above, it is considered that the proposal will not cause loss of amenity to the adjoining occupiers by reason of visual intrusion, or loss of light or aspect, and as such complies with policy UD3 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The application site comprises the block of flats known as Jameson Lodge, 58 Shepherds Hill on the south side of Shepherds Hill N6. It is located within the Crouch End Conservation Area. Two previous schemes have been refused for this development, one of which has been dismissed on appeal. This current scheme takes into account the issues raised by the Inspector in his appeal decision, principally visual intrusion and overlooking. This proposal seeks an additional floor at roof level comprising 1 x 1-bed and 1 x 3-bed self-contained flats. The proposed addition is largely glazed to the front and cedar clad to the sides.

The proposed development is considered to complement the character of the surrounding area in terms of scale, bulk and appearance and is generally appropriate to the location. It is considered the proposed addition is of an appropriate size and bulk in relation to the original block and is set back from the edges of the block to retain its original shape and appearance. Also, it will not result in excessive height relative to other similar blocks in the surrounding

area. The proposal is therefore considered to meet the requirements of policies UD3 and UD4 in terms of size bulk and appearance.

In terms of design and appearance, the proposed addition is considered to be appropriate to the existing building in that the structure has clean modern lines in lightweight, contrasting materials appropriate to the location and so complies with policy CSV5. It is also considered that the proposal will not cause loss of amenity to the adjoining occupiers by reason of visual intrusion, or loss of light or aspect, and as such complies with policy UD3 of the Unitary Development Plan 2006.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **GRANT PERMISSION**

Registered No. HGY/2007/1651

Applicant's drawing Nos. 100, 101 Rev A & 102 Rev A.

Subject to the following conditions:

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.
3. Notwithstanding the description of the materials in the application, no development shall be commenced until precise details 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.  
Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development in the interest of the visual amenity of the area.
4. That no part of the development hereby approved or any part of the flat roof area of the existing building shall be used as a roof terrace or other amenity space in connection with the flats hereby approved.  
Reason: To safeguard the amenity of surrounding occupiers
5. 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.

## REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The proposed addition is considered to be appropriate to the existing building in that the structure has clean modern lines in lightweight, contrasting materials appropriate to the location and so complies with Policies CSV5 'Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas' and UD4 'Quality Design' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan. It is also considered that the proposal will not cause loss of amenity to the adjoining occupiers by reason of visual intrusion, or loss of light or aspect, and as such complies with Policy UD3 'General Principles' of the Unitary Development Plan 2006