



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2021

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3273674

Bloomfield Court, Bloomfield Road, Highgate, London N6 4ES

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Ms Susan Clarke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/2859, dated 19 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 4 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is the creation of additional third floor roof extension to accommodate 4 x 1-bedroom flats within; with associated external alterations to rear elevation glazing and re-covering of retained elements of existing roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the description of development above from the Council's decision notice and the appeal form as it is more succinct than the description included in the planning application form.
3. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in July 2021. This has replaced the 2019 iteration. The main parties were given the opportunity to comment upon the implications of the revised Framework.
4. The Council's decision notice refers to policies of the London Plan 2016. The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London (March 2021) (The London Plan 2021) has now been adopted. The Council has provided the revised policies and the appellant has been given the opportunity to make a submission. In light of this re-consultation, I am satisfied that no party has been prejudiced by my consideration of the appeal proposal against the policies of The London Plan 2021.

Main Issue

5. Whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area (the HCA).

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located within the HCA, which covers an extensive area and whose significance is largely derived from the relationship between open spaces and verdant streets with high quality historic properties. Although there is variety in the built form in the immediate street scene, it is the substantial

size of the properties, their prominent siting and presence in the street scene and the traditional detailing that contributes towards the significance of this part of the HCA.

7. The appeal property is a large, three storey block of flats made up of two interlinked sections. Although it is three storeys in height, its hipped roof with small crown section to the middle and its positioning at the bottom of a hill ensures it relates well in scale and appearance to the predominantly smaller dwellings in the immediate locality. By virtue of its design and corner positioning, the appeal building is a distinguished feature in the street scene and makes a positive contribution to the HCA.
8. The proposed mansard roof profile, with dormer windows, would introduce a significantly different roof form and pitch to the host building. Whilst only marginally higher than the existing roof, the considerably steeper roof planes would largely read as full elevations, causing the proposal to appear as an additional floor rather than a subservient roof extension. This would interrupt the traditional proportions of the existing building and, unlike the existing roof, the altered roof would appear as a top-heavy and bulky addition that would be overbearing to the host building. This incongruous design would be readily apparent and overly prominent from the public realm.
9. The full details and circumstances that lead to the approval of other mansard extensions in the area are not before me, so a direct and fully reasoned comparison is not possible.
10. Given the scale of the development in context, the harm it would cause to the significance of the HCA would be less than substantial. The Framework is clear that irrespective of the level of harm, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation and, where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
11. The proposed development would make use of a small site and deliver four dwellings which would provide minor support to the Council's housing supply. The proposal would also give rise to some economic benefits during construction and on subsequent occupation of the units. However, due to the small scale of the proposal these public benefits would be limited and would not therefore outweigh the identified harm to the HCA.
12. Accordingly, the proposed development would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the HCA and it would conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2023 (March 2013), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (July 2017), Policy DH2 of A Plan for Highgate, Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017, and the requirements of the Framework. Together these policies seek to ensure that developments are of sensitive design quality that respects local context and conserves or enhances the significance of heritage assets.
13. Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 has been referred to by the Council however, as this relates to space standards, I do not consider it relevant to the main issue of this appeal.

Other Matter

14. On 19 January 2021 the Government published the 2020 Housing Delivery Test (HDT) results. The HDT results show that the Council of the London Borough of Haringey has delivered 60% of its housing requirement over the latest 3-year period. Consequently, the presumption in favour of sustainable development contained within paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is of relevance. However, as the policies in the Framework relating to heritage assets provide a clear reason for refusing the development proposed, as identified above, paragraph 11 d) of the Framework is not engaged.

Conclusion

15. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no other considerations advanced, including the Framework, that indicate a decision otherwise would be appropriate. Thus, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR