



CABINET

Monday, 24th February, 2020
at 6.00 pm

Council Chamber Hackney Town Hall, Mare Street, London E8 1EA

MAYOR AND CABINET
(The Executive)

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA ITEM 17

REVISED APPENDICES B AND C

Tim Shields
Chief Executive

Contact: Clifford Hart, Governance Services Officer
Tel: 020 8356 3597
Clifford.hart@hackney.gov.uk

18 February 2020

The press and public are welcome to attend this meeting

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO CONDUCT BUSINESS IN PRIVATE, ANY
REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND THE RESPONSE TO ANY SUCH
REPRESENTATIONS

Whilst much of the business on the agenda for this meeting will be open to the public and media to attend, there will sometimes be business to be considered that contains, for example, confidential, commercially sensitive or personal information.

This is the formal 5 clear day notice under The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012 to confirm that this Cabinet meeting will not be held partly in private.

The 28 clear day notice for this meeting was published last month in the Executive Meetings and Key Decisions Notice. This gave notice that there was no intention to meet in private after the public meeting to consider reports which contain exempt or confidential information.

Contact for Information

Clifford Hart
Tel: 020 8356 3597
Email: Clifford.hart@hackney.gov.uk

CABINET AGENDA
SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA ITEM 17
Monday, 24th February, 2020

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Item No	Non - key Decision - Designation of Brownswood Conservation Area	
17	PLEASE SUBSTITUTE THE ATTACHED REVISED APPENDICES B & C FOR THOSE CONTAINED IN THE PUBLISHED AGENDA PACK FOR THE MEETING.	(Pages 1 - 14)
	Wards Affected	Contact Officers
	Brownswood	Matt Payne, Conservation and Design Officer Tel: 020 8356 8106

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet

24 FEBRUARY 2020

Non - key Decision

**Designation of Brownswood
Conservation Area**

Revised Appendix B

This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet

24 FEBRUARY 2020

Non - key Decision

**Designation of Brownswood
Conservation Area**

Revised Appendix C

This page is intentionally left blank

Summary of Responses Received by 30/01/2020

Respondent ID	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
BCA01	Emma Goodman	N/A	14/12/19	0.01	Supports the designation but concerns on whether residents may be put off from completing repairs owing to the additional costs involved.	Noted. If like for like repairs and replacements are conducted then there would be no requirements for an application to be submitted.
BCA02	Janine Tregelles	N/A	17/12/19	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA03	Hugh A. White	Wilberforce Road Guardians	17/12/19	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA04	Louis Coningsby	N/A	22/12/19	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area but had concerns that an increase in vehicles could may impact the Conservation Area and requested an additional point in the Management Plan to ensure that all development proposals in close proximity of the proposed conservation area will be assessed to ensure no adverse effects cause by an increase in vehicle movement.	Noted. Assessment of development proposals with regards to vehicular movements is a seperate process to designation.
				0.02	Requests a reference in the management plan to the retention of the vehile barriers to ensure that the area remains tranquil compared to the surrounding area.	Noted. This has been added to the Management Plan.
BCA05	Sophie Brewitt	N/A	23/12/19	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA06	Peter Dacre	N/A	31/12/19	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA07	Winnier Dacre	N/A	31/12/19	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA08	Melinda Darbyshire	N/A	03/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area. Surprised that the area was not already a conservation Area and question whether it had lapsed	Noted.
BCA09	Nick Baker	N/A	03/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA10	Richard Brooks	N/A	03/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA11	J Rutherford	N/A	04/01/20	0.01	Objects to the designation of the Brownswood Conservation Area as it would not protect a number of recently removed street trees. Would only support the designation if the trees were protected.	Noted. The designation would not retrospectively protect trees recently removed. However, the recently removed trees were as a result of ill health with replacement trees due to be planted within this planting season.
BCA12	Zoe Lang	N/A	05/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area. Suggested including information regarding the distinctive nail head stretched found on Finsbury Park Road and the distinctive porches on Finsbury Park Road.	Noted. However, the level of detail is considered satisfactory for the purpose of this designation.
BCA13	Charlotte Heath	N/A	05/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA14	Stephen Southern	N/A	05/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA15	Toby Skales	N/A	06/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA16	Irene Weinreb	N/A	07/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA17	Eric Brunner	N/A	07/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA18	Rose and David Gaunt	N/A	07/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA19	Clare Beer	N/A	08/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area. Concern over a property that has not been built in accordance with the approved plans.	Noted. This matter has been passed to the Planning Enforcement Team for investigation.
BCA21	Lesley John	N/A	10/01/19	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA22	Steve Miles	N/A	12/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA23	Alastair Hall	N/A	12/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area. Concern over the growth of large basements under houses.	Noted. The designation does not have the power to prevent consented basements but with future applications the impact on the conservation area will be considered.
				0.02	Wanted clarification on whether the Article 4 direction limit the installation of solar panels on roofs along the street-facing facades?	The proposed Article 4 direction will mean that planning permission will be needed for solar panels on roofs, and often it is encouraged to place them on the rear roof slopes only. However, this does not automatically mean that Planning Permission will not be given on the front roof slope as each application will be judged on its merits.
				0.03	Required clarification on potential climate change adaptation measures including double glazing windows and rainwater harvesting.	It can be possible to install double glazing within Conservation Areas but in order to retain the refinement of the original sash windows this will often be slimline double glazing with a maximum thickness of 12mm.
				0.04	Clarification on whether the council is seeking to preserve only the street facades.	The focus on the character and appearance of the entirety of the Conservation Area. There is often greater flexibility to the rear of properties when hidden from the public realm.
				0.05	Clarification on whether the council would support installing rooflights and the impact of pre-designation precedents.	Pre Conservation Area precedents will not set an automatic precedent but each application will be judged on its merits and in line with the Hackney Residential and Extensions SPD.
				0.06	Clarification on whether repairs were acceptable.	Minor repair work such as this would not require Planning Permission.
				0.07	Concern raised over the plans to demolish buildings on Seven Sisters Road and the end of Wilberforce Road.	Noted.

Summary of Responses Received by 30/01/2020

Respondent ID	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
BCA24	Mohsin Nazir	N/A	13/01/20	0.01	Supports the principle of the designation but raises concerns that the area should be included to include Princess Crescent, Alexandra Grove, Gloucester Drive	A potential Conservation Area in the Brownswood Area has been under consideration by the Council for some time. The proposed boundary was determined following careful research of the area's history, character and appearance. The merits of including surrounding streets such as Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent have also been assessed. Conservation Areas require special architectural and historic interest to warrant designation. Whilst the areas in question are similar in some ways they are considered to be less ornate with a simpler design than that of neighbouring streets. Moreover, there has been a higher level of unsympathetic alterations which considerably impact the uniformity and group value of the buildings and spaces.
BCA25	David Ward	N/A	13/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	In favour of an Article 4 Direction so that undue planning applications for HMO's can be dealt with	The use of the Article 4 Direction will not prevent the creation of HMO's but will ensure that any change such as the creation of large binstores and bike shelters to front gardens are carefully considered.
BCA26	Rachel Weston	N/A	13/01/20	0.01	Supports the principle of the designation but raises concerns that the area should be included to include Princess Crescent, Alexandra Grove, Gloucester Drive. States that the architectural features are unique.	A potential Conservation Area in the Brownswood Area has been under consideration by the Council for some time. The proposed boundary was determined following careful research of the area's history, character and appearance. The merits of including surrounding streets such as Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent have also been assessed. Conservation Areas require special architectural and historic interest to warrant designation. Whilst the areas in question are similar in some ways they are considered to be less ornate with a simpler design than that of neighbouring streets. Moreover, there has been a higher level of unsympathetic alterations which considerably impact the uniformity and group value of the buildings and spaces.
BCA27	Christine Shields	N/A	13/01/20	0.01	Supports the principle of the designation but raises concerns that the area should be included to include Princess Crescent, Alexandra Grove, Gloucester Drive	A potential Conservation Area in the Brownswood Area has been under consideration by the Council for some time. The proposed boundary was determined following careful research of the area's history, character and appearance. The merits of including surrounding streets such as Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent have also been assessed. Conservation Areas require special architectural and historic interest to warrant designation. Whilst the areas in question are similar in some ways they are considered to be less ornate with a simpler design than that of neighbouring streets. Moreover, there has been a higher level of unsympathetic alterations which considerably impact the uniformity and group value of the buildings and spaces.
BCA28	Rosemond Kinsey Milner	N/A	13/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area. Concern over whether enforcement has enough power to stop the demolition of 2 properties (hotels).	The aforementioned application has now been withdrawn.
				0.02	Concern over the impact of extensions on Blackstock Road.	Any future application will have to consider the setting of the Conservation Area and will have to comply with the Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD. Ultimately every application will be judged on its own merits.
				0.03	Questions whether the council will have additional powers to insist on repairs in dilapidated properties.	The designation will not provide additional powers. However, Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 enables a Local Planning Authority (LPA) to serve a notice if they judge the condition of land or buildings to be harmful to the area.
				0.05	Questions whether the designation would limit Airbnb visitors on the road.	The designation of this area as a Conservation would not stop the use of it an Airbnb.
BCA29	Esther Saraga	N/A	13/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA30	Dr P Carr	N/A	13/01/20	0.01	Concern that the ex-council flats in Queens Drive are labeled negative buildings.	Owing to the scale and massing of the blocks and location within the site they appear at odds with the surrounding rhythm and uniformity of the street and wider conservation area. As such they have been identified as a negative contributor.
				0.02	Disappointed that the Pembury Hotel may be demolished and would resist it.	Noted.
				0.03	On the other hand the ugly new structure in Wilberforce Road which is at odds with the surroundings is applauded and accepted.	Noted.
BCA31	Kate Tarling	N/A	14/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	Concerns over the vibrations from buses on Brownswood road, the poor condition of the road and if reinstatement of single glazing would be required,	As the property is a flat the replacement windows other than like for like would require Planning Permission. Whilst each application is judged on its merits, the use of certain forms of double glazing owing to the close proximity of the road would likely be considered acceptable. The aim is to, where possible preserve the historic timber sash and case windows.
				0.03	Concern raised over a number of abandoned buildings on Brownswood Road.	This matter has been passed on to the Planning Enforcement Team.
				0.04	Concern over whether windows would need to be replaced immediately in order to comply with the Conservation Area Designation.	The designation of the Conservation Area will not require remedial action such as window changed. However, when windows are being replaced the use of timber sash and case windows would be encouraged. However, each application would be judged on its own merits.
				0.05	Wanted clarification on what unobtrusive bin housing would look like.	The Council is currently producing an updated Residential Alterations and Extensions SPD and a new Historic Environment SPD which will include guidance on appropriate bin stores. For now the Conservation, Urban Design and Sustainability Team can provide suitable precedents.

Summary of Responses Received by 30/01/2020

Respondent ID	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
BCA32	Sarah Birch	N/A	14/02/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA33	Name withheld	N/A	14/02/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area and the the Article 4 Direction subject to caveats regarding housing needs and climate change challenges.	Noted.
				0.02	Requests that the designation takes into account Hackney's Housing Needs and that suitable conversions from homes to flats are allowed. These should also consider communal facilities.	Noted. Each application for conversion of dwelling houses will be judged on its own merits.
				0.03	Suggests that the Planning Service engage with waste and proposed the standardisation of bins.	This is a separate matter outside the remit of conservation area designation.
				0.04	Concern over the impact of climate change such as solar panels, additional bicycle parking and car sharing. Suggests liaising with the team looking at the new cycle route through Finsbury Park.	The proposed Article 4 direction will mean that planning permission will be needed for solar panels on roofs, and often it is encouraged to place them on the rear roof slopes only. However, this does not automatically mean that Planning Permission will not be given on the front roof slope as each application will be judged on its merits.
BCA34	Margaret Baddeley, Steven Baddelley, Alex Butterworth, Georgia Butterword & Elena Butterworth	N/A	14/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	Suggests the council should have a coordinated approach with Planning and cycle strategies.	The Management Plan enables future work with colleagues in the Highways department in order to bring improvements to cycle strategies in the conservation area.
				0.03	Concern over tree removal.	A number of street trees have recently been removed following a survey which found a number of them were sick. Replacement trees are due to be planted within the current planting season.
BCA35	Keith Tallentine	N/A	14.01.20	0.01	Supports the principle of the designation but raises concerns that the area should be included to include Princess Crescent, Alexandra Grove, Gloucester Drive. States that the additional streets have the same characteristics as the proposed conservation area with a common architectural character throughout. Public realm is good quality and historic association with the new river. Would help prevent inappropriate development.	A potential Conservation Area in the Brownswood Area has been under consideration by the Council for some time. The proposed boundary was determined following careful research of the area's history, character and appearance. The merits of including surrounding streets such as Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent have also been assessed. Conservation Areas require special architectural and historic interest to warrant designation. Whilst the areas in question are similar in some ways they are considered to be less ornate with a simpler design than that of neighbouring streets. Moreover, there has been a higher level of unsympathetic alterations which considerably impact the uniformity and group value of the buildings and spaces.
				0.02	States that the Stoke Newington Reservoirs, filter beds and New River Conservation Area referred to including the buildings on Gloucester Drive. Concerned that the area was overlooked in the 2017 Conservation Area Review Study.	The Stoke Newington Reservoirs, filter beds and New River Conservation Area was designated in 1986. Since then the area surrounding it has undergone considerable change such as the building of a housing estate over the filter beds. Within this period the properties in Gloucester Drive have undergone further alterations which as a result has impacted the uniformity and group value.
BCA36	Magnus Irvin	N/A	15/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA37	Hugh White	Wilberforce Road Guardians			In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA38	Mary Currie	N/A	15/01/20	0.01	Raises concerns that the area should be included to include Portland Rise, Gloucester Drive and Adolphus Road. States that the additional streets have the same characteristics as the proposed conservation area with a common architectural character throughout. Agree that Finsbury Park Road and Wilberforce Road have special interest but that Queens Drive and Somerfield Road is a mixture that could not be described as special or exceptional.	A potential Conservation Area in the Brownswood Area has been under consideration by the Council for some time. The proposed boundary was determined following careful research of the area's history, character and appearance. The merits of including surrounding streets such as Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent have also been assessed. Conservation Areas require special architectural and historic interest to warrant designation. Whilst the areas in question are similar in some ways they are considered to be less ornate with a simpler design than that of neighbouring streets. Moreover, there has been a higher level of unsympathetic alterations which considerably impact the uniformity and group value of the buildings and spaces. The Council considers Queens Drive and Somerfield Road meet the criteria for conservation area designation.
				0.02	Concerned that the excluded roads will be more vulnerable to external developers.	Applications outside the proposed conservation area will be judged on their own merits according to relevant policies and guidance.
BCA39	Robert Parker	N/A	15/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA40	John Butler			0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area and Article 4 Direction	Noted.
BCA41	Robin Mallalieu	N/A	16/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA42	Robert Carr	N/A	16/02/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	Concern that the area may be transformed into a middle class gheto as the existing character has a slightly Bohemian character.	Noted, the designation of a Conservation Area is not designed to transform the area but ensure what it special about the area is preserved and where possible enhanced.
				0.03	Dustmen demand easy access to dustbins	The management plan recommends the installation of bin stores within front gardens to ensure an improved frontage and reduce the impact of street clutter.
				0.04	Query the designation of St John's Court as a negative building as it matches the neighbouring estate and is a good example of Municipal architecture.	Owing to the scale and massing of the blocks and location within the site they appear at odds with the surrounding rhythm and uniformity of the street and wider conservation area. As such they have been identified as a negative contributor.

Summary of Responses Received by 30/01/2020

Respondent ID	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
BCA43	John Burrows	N/A	16/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	Concern over the threat of new large basements under the existing properties.	Noted. The designation of a conservation area will not automatically prevent the digging of new basements but any front alterations such as lowering windows or inserting lightwells will require consideration of the wider impact on the conservation area.
BCA44	Mary Rawlindon	N/A	17/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA45	Astrid Sieben	N/A	17/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA46	Pat Castle	N/A	17/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA47	John and Anita Anderson	N/A	0.01		In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA48	Bernhard von Stengel	N/A	20/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
			20/01/20	0.02	Concerns over whether the installation of solar panels would be allowed and if they are not the conservation area would not be supported.	Each application will be judged on its own merits but within Conservation Areas it is often possible to install appropriately located solar panels. The council supports responsible retrofitting of traditional buildings.
BCA49	James Anderson	N/A	20/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area. Raised concern over boarding raised adjacent to property.	Noted. The complaint has been passed to Planning Enforcement.
BCA50	Janis Persaud	N/A	20/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA51	Benjamin Counsell	N/A	20/01/20	0.01	Objects to the creation of Brownswood Conservation Area on the grounds that it goes against the Council's commitments to do everything it can to address our dual housing and climate crises.	Noted.
				0.02	Concern creation a Conservation Area within a short distance of the transport hub of Finsbury Park Station will limit the capabilities of sites within the Conservation Area such as the hotels on Seven Sisters Road.	The council is under a statutory duty under s71 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which states "Every local planning authority— (a)shall from time to time determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, and (b)shall designate those areas as conservation areas."
				0.03	Concern that limiting the residential density in an inner-London area has the effect of forcing more people to live further out.	The council is under a statutory duty under s69 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which states "Every local planning authority— (a)shall from time to time determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, and (b)shall designate those areas as conservation areas."
				0.04	Concern over the limitations on what alterations can be made to thermally inefficient Victorian Buildings within a Conservation Area including upgrading windows and solar panels. These upgrades are essential to tackle our carbon emissions.	Disagree. Conservation Area designation is not about preventing change but about managing the process. Each application will be judged on its own merits but within Conservation Areas it is often possible to upgrade windows and install appropriately located solar panels. The council supports responsible retrofitting of traditional buildings.
				0.05	Concern that no social or environmental impact assessment has been conducted.	An Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken and found that the proposals do not unfairly discriminate against any equality groups. There is no statutory requirement for social or environment impact assessments to be made for conservation area designations.
				0.06	Noted that similar arguments were made in regard to the South Shoreditch Conservation Area Extension.	Noted.
BCA52	Liz Hemmings	N/A	20/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA53	Miles Mooney	N/A	20/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	Raised concern over the proposed demolition of two hotels on Seven Sisters Road.	Noted. The application to demolish these buildings has now been withdrawn.
BCA54	Christian Bonato	N/A	20/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	Concern over the erection of a fence on a street facing section of wall.	This issue has been reported to Planning Enforcement.
BCA55	Halina High	N/A	21/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA56	Ignus Froneman	Purely Investment Ltd	20/01/20	0.01	The broad rationale for the wider conservation area designation is not disputed and neither is the inclusion of 25 and 27 Wilberforce Road.	Noted.
				0.02	However, 3 - 7, 9 - 15 and 17 - 23 Wilberforce Road have all suffered high levels of alteration and do not reflect what is special about the character and appearance of the area or add to the coherence, quality, character and architectural form of the street.	Disagree. The Council's view is that whilst there has been degrees of alteration the buildings have historic and architectural interest and positively contribute to the conservation area. They have considerable group value as good as examples of late Victorian housing.
				0.03	The Draft Appraisal states that the "original character" of 3 - 15 Wilberforce Road "can still be clearly appreciated" despite "harmful changes".	Noted.
				0.04	The considerable changes that have been made to these buildings have materially affected the positive qualities they once had.	Disagree. The majority of the original architectural elements including stucco detailing and bay windows survive. Where side extensions exist they are subservient to the main elevation.
				0.05	To suggest that these are 'Positive Buildings' is illogical, due to their heavy alteration.	Disagree. Despite the alterations the buildings are still considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
				0.06	To include these buildings as 'Positive Buildings' would mean that preserving them in their present state would preserve what is special about the conservation area.	The buildings in question are contemporary with the other buildings in the Conservation Area and positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.

Summary of Responses Received by 30/01/2020

Respondent ID	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
				0.07	Yet, in spite of the heavy alterations, the Draft Appraisal categorises them as making the same contribution as the unaltered houses on Wilberforce Road.	The buildings in question are contemporary with the other buildings in the Conservation Area and positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
				0.08	A few detracting changes across the houses at 3 - 23 Wilberforce Road would not materially alter the character and appearance of the area.	The buildings in question are contemporary with the other buildings in the Conservation Area and positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
				0.09	However, the whole character of 3 - 23 Wilberforce Road has changed due to the amount of alterations and infills, making markedly different to the original houses in the street. This has two consequences: 1) The 11 contiguous houses are manifestly different from the houses that have not been altered. 2) Because the 11 houses are characterised by extensions and are still identified as positive contributors, it follows that the same extensions must be acceptable elsewhere, despite this being incompatible with the Draft Appraisal and the character and appearance of the conservation area.	The buildings in question are contemporary with the other buildings in the Conservation Area and positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
				0.1	Had no.s 3 - 23 been classed as neutral, they could not reasonably been included in the proposed conservation area as they represent a peripheral pocket of townscape, which is not in itself of special interest.	Noted. However, as per the Council's assessment, these buildings are identified as positive contributors. These have also been identified as Non-Designated Heritage Assets which formed part of the refusal reasons for the demolition of these buildings and erection of a replacement building. This refusal was not appealed.
				0.11	The conservation area designation is not set out in legislation as an aspirational designation, ie it cannot be used in the hope of improving the character of the area.	Disagree. The designation recognises the special character and appearance of the area and the Management Plan seeks to ensure that new developments and alterations preserve or enhance this character.
				0.12	Designating numbers 3 - 23 would devalue the designation contrary to Government guidance and legislation.	Disagree. As per the Council's assessment, these buildings are identified as positive contributors. These have also been identified as Non-Designated Heritage Assets which formed part of the refusal reasons for the demolition of these buildings and erection of a replacement building. This refusal was not appealed.
				0.13	Consequently the designation of no.s 3 - 23 would depart from section 69(1) of the 1990 Act and the NPPF.	Disagree. The buildings are considered to positively contribute to the conservation area. The council is under a statutory duty under s71 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which states "Every local planning authority— (a)shall from time to time determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, and (b)shall designate those areas as conservation areas."
				0.14	The obvious way to address this would be to amend the boundary to exclude 3 - 23 Wilberforce Road.	Disagree. The boundary has been carefully reviewed and is considered to include the area that is of special architectural and historic interest.
BCA57	Linda Butler	N/A	21/02/20		In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA58	Janet Evans	N/A	21/02/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA59	Susie Barson	N/A	22/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area. Concern over a number spelling errors.	Noted. The corrections have been made.
BCA60	Harry Chapman	N/A	24/01/2020	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA61	Gabriel Cradden	N/A	24/02/2020	0.01	Generally in favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area but concern that it may make retrofitting of buildings harder such as improved insulation.	The designation of the area as a Conservation Area does not preserve the buildings in aspic but is designed to ensure change is managed. This does not automatically prevent the retrofitting of buildings but that these need careful consideration. Internal insulation would not require planning permission.
				0.02	States that hotels near Seven Sisters Road should be torn down and replaced with high rise owing to the proximity with Finsbury Park Station.	The buildings in question are contemporary with the other buildings in the Conservation Area and the Council considers these positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area.
				0.03	Concern that the Management Plan is not ambitious enough such stating that on-street parking detracts from the area but does not aim to remove it. Recommends parking spaces could be replaced with bike parking, benches, or flower beds and trees in order to restore the streets to social spaces.	The Management Plan enables future work with colleagues in the Highways Department to bring about improvements in the area with regards to on-street parking in the conservation area.
BCA62	Catherine Lang	N/A	26/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA63	Elizabeth Arlango	N/A	54 Finsbury Park Road	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA64	Nic Knowland	N/A	27/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	Suggest that good quality composite tiles in black or dark grey should be allowed.	Each application for replacement roof materials will be judged on a case by case basis.
				0.03	Suggests that rear extensions should have more freedom to incorporate fully glazed sun rooms to benefit from the solar gain in the spring or autumn.	There is often greater flexibility with rear extensions but all extensions should be in line with the residential alterations and extensions SPD.
				0.04	Suggests that solar panels should be encouraged as long as they are not visible from the road.	The proposed Article 4 direction will mean that planning permission will be needed for solar panels on roofs, and often it is encouraged to place them on the rear roof slopes only. However, this does not automatically mean that Planning Permission will not be given on the front roof slope as each application will be judged on its merits.
				0.05	Agree that York Paving should be used to replace concrete versions.	The Council will encourage the use of York paving in place of concrete.
BCA65	Karin Murray	N/A	27/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA66	Barry Jackson	N/A	27/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.

Summary of Responses Received by 30/01/2020

Respondent ID	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
BCA67	Elena Isayev	N/A	27/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area and the proposed limits on the description of sections of the neighbourhood.	Noted.
				0.02	Against the proposal of the Article 4 Direction would remove specific rights for the following reasons: The existing planning laws and regulations are sufficient enough to prevent the demolition of buildings such as on Wilberforce Road, hence no additional requirements are needed.	The Article 4 direction is primarily for individual dwelling houses as properties that have already been converted into flats do not have permitted development rights. Section 6.0 of the Appraisal contains as assessment of condition and demonstrates the threats to the conservation area, many of which under existing legislation would be possible to undertake.
				0.03	The threats as outline in the Appraisal are relatively few and mainly due to war damage replacement. Suggest that new houses such as 155 Wilberforce Road is seen as a positive addition and that modern features can be seen to be adding to the continually changing nature of the neighbourhood. Do not see modernisation and the mix as a problem as one of the characters of the neighbourhood is the changing character of the neighbourhood. Concern that it would lock the area into one specific time period.	The designation as a Conservation Area is not designed to preserve one particular historic period but preserve the special architectural and historic character of the area and ensure that change is managed sympathetically.
				0.04	Concern over the lack information on the historic development in the 20th century and fails to cover the diversity and rich history which is subsumed under the umbrella term of Social Decline. Concern that these have negative connotations when these groups were the ones who have been custodians of the neighbourhood and have retained its character. The Article 4 is therefore not considered to be needed as it prevents the kind of activity and transformation that have made it the place it is.	The Appraisal does not cover the twentieth century in detail as the area underwent limited building development within this period. The text in the Appraisal has been altered to remove any associated negative connotations. Section 6.0 of the Appraisal contains as assessment of condition and demonstrates the threats to the conservation area. The proposal is not to prevent change but to ensure that change is managed to preserve or enhance the special architectural and historic interest.
				0.05	Concern over the additional cost of planning permissions etc for changes such resurfacing a drive to fixing the roof and changing the windows. Concern that the additional Article 4 would actually make people less like to complete the work owing to the excessive cost.	The Article 4 direction is primarily for individual dwelling houses as properties that have already been converted into flats do not have permitted development rights. If a proposal is for a like for like replacement, identical in every way then planning permission would not be needed. Moreover, like for like repairs such as fixing a roof would not require consent.
BCA68	Kristina Eriksen	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area but concerned over the state of the pavement outside Barcham House.	Noted.
BCA69	Kate Burvill	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area. Hope the area can retains its special character.	Noted.
BCA70	Richard Jackson	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA71	Elizabeth Lowe	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	Subject to the following concerns the principle of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area is supported.	Noted.
				0.02	Concerned that the designation will prevent properties being improved to adapt to climate change and street 'furniture' in line with climate change needs	The proposed Article 4 direction will mean that planning permission will be needed for solar panels on roofs, and often it is encouraged to place them on the rear roof slopes only. However, this does not automatically mean that Planning Permission will not be given on the front roof slope as each application will be judged on its merits.
				0.03	Concerned that it would prevent the ability to adapt properties to ensure that full use is made of them to address the chronic housing needs in Hackney.	The Conservation Area designation is not designed to prevent buildings being adapted but will ensure that the proposals are given special consideration to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is retained.
BCA72	Alejandra Martins	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA73	John Grant	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	Concerned that the proposed conservation area does not include the streets in the north and east of Brownswood Ward. Specifically Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent.	A potential Conservation Area in the Brownswood Area has been under consideration by the Council for some time. The proposed boundary was determined following careful research of the area's history, character and appearance. The merits of including surrounding streets such as Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent have also been assessed. Conservation Areas require special architectural and historic interest to warrant designation. Whilst the areas in question are similar in some ways they are considered to be less ornate with a simpler design than that of neighbouring streets. Moreover, there has been a higher level of unsympathetic alterations which considerably impact the uniformity and group value of the buildings and spaces.
				0.02	Proposes to build a detailed case and generate support in the area and urges this option to be considered at cabinet.	Upon receipt of any further information the Council will consider the possible extension but this will not change the existing proposal to designate.
BCA74	Hannah Anderson	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA75	Nick Inge	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	Concerned that the views of the residents of excluded Brownswood streets have not been taken into account. These roads have a similar Victorian heritage. Expressed surprise that the area has not been included.	A potential Conservation Area in the Brownswood Area has been under consideration by the Council for some time. The proposed boundary was determined following careful research of the area's history, character and appearance. The merits of including surrounding streets such as Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent have also been assessed. Conservation Areas require special architectural and historic interest to warrant designation. Whilst the areas in question are similar in some ways they are considered to be less ornate with a simpler design than that of neighbouring streets. Moreover, there has been a higher level of unsympathetic alterations which considerably impact the uniformity and group value of the buildings and spaces.
NCA76	Anthony O'Brien & Theresa Boden	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.

Summary of Responses Received by 30/01/2020						
Respondent ID	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
BCA77				0.02	Concern over proposals to alter Barcham House, Riversdale Road and the poor condition of the pavements.	This is a separate matter outside the remit of conservation area designation.
BCA78	Jérémie Grienberger	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA79	Peter Kenyon	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA80	Felicity Shiel	N/A	29/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
				0.02	Raised concern that it was unclear how to comment on the proposals in the documentation or on the website.	Noted. The letter and appraisal contained contact information including emails and phone numbers for the comments to be submitted.
BCA81	Narita Charkroborty	Dexter Moren Associates	43859	0.01	The study is not an objection to the Conservation Area in principle, indeed the special interest of most of the proposed area is clearly formed. Objects to including 326-328 Seven Sisters Road and 167-169 Queens Drive in the Conservation Area as the buildings do not demonstrate they have 'special interest'	The buildings in question are contemporary with the other buildings in the Conservation Area representing a hierarchy of houses with the larger detached and semi-detached properties facing Finsbury Park. The buildings have been identified as positively contributing to the character and appearance of the area.
				0.02	The Council's assessment of the proposed conservation area is the quality, coherence, cohesion and consistency reflected in architecture, specifically in identical design elements and semi-detached properties.	Noted.
				0.03	Acknowledges that they are illustrative of the expansion of the city during a time of great expansion but there is nothing to set these buildings apart from the swathes of late-19th century houses across Hackney and London. On the contrary the illustrative value has been eroded by the alterations which have affected their authenticity and character	The buildings in question are contemporary with the other buildings in the Conservation Area and positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area. Alterations are generally limited with the original character and distinctive architectural features still present.
				0.04	The buildings are architecturally unexceptional and unremarkable. The group represent an ordinary example of late-19th century terraces.	The council's view is that it is an area of special architectural and historic interest as identified in the 2006 and 2017 Conservation Area Reviews and the Appraisal. The overall area has considerable group value owing to the intactness and relatively low levels of later development.
				0.05	No.167 is dilapidated and is boarded up, detracting away from the proposed Conservation Area.	Condition is not related to significance. A conservation area designation provides an opportunity for enhancement to be brought forward.
				0.06	The buildings are converted to commercial use, more akin to the uses along Seven Sisters Road and the local town centre at Finsbury Park Station. They do not have the quiet 'suburban characteristic of the residential hinterland, nor do they represent the 'high quality Victorian housing' which is proposed in the designation.	The buildings on Queens Drive are in an area of identical properties in a quiet road and therefore considered to have the residential character. The buildings on Seven Sisters Road are considered important examples of the grand Victorian houses, overlooking Finsbury Park.
				0.07	Questions whether the buildings should be identified as positive contributors as they have been heavily altered with only vestiges of their original architectural detailing retained. Appraisal fails to identify what is positive about the buildings and how that contributes to the conservation area.	The Council's view is that the buildings make a positive contribution to the area as the properties retain.
				0.08	No.169 is near absorbed by the later additions to 326-328 Seven Sisters Road	The building is located within its own plot, set away from the neighbouring property. The boundary treatments also reflect the original form with central gate. Owing to the distinctive architectural features it is read as a separate entity.
				0.09	No.326-328 retain only some of their Victorian features to the front elevation. Their flank and rear elevations have been altered beyond recognition. Their roof form has been altered and windows replaced with UPVC.	The properties contain the majority of the original Victorian features to the front elevation.
				0.1	By identifying the buildings as positive contributors, the Appraisal attaches a need to 'preserve' them in their present state.	By identifying the buildings as positive it seeks to preserve the elements of special architectural and historic interest.
				0.11	The buildings lack the quality, coherence and consistency reflected in architecture of the proposed designated area. Surrounded by modern buildings they lack group value with the wider residential area.	The buildings in question are contemporary with the other buildings in the Conservation Area and positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area. Alterations are generally limited with the original character and distinctive architectural features still present. By identifying the buildings as positive it seeks to preserve the elements of special architectural and historic interest.
BCA82	Sara Burgess	N/A	30/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA83	James O'Carroll	N/A	30/01/20	0.01	Against the creation of the Conservation in the current format. Considers the boundary arbitrary and does not include similar worthy properties.	A potential Conservation Area in the Brownswood Area has been under consideration by the Council for some time. The proposed boundary was determined following careful research of the area's history, character and appearance. The merits of including surrounding streets such as Gloucester Drive, Adolphus Road, Alexandra Grove, Portland Rise, Henry Road and Princess Crescent have also been assessed. Conservation Areas require special architectural and historic interest to warrant designation. Whilst the areas in question are similar in some ways they are considered to be less ornate with a simpler design than that of neighbouring streets. Moreover, there has been a higher level of unsympathetic alterations which considerably impact the uniformity and group value of the buildings and spaces.
				0.02	The building stock, while aesthetically pleasing and worth preserving is not always maintained to the standard one would like to have. The introduction of the Conservation Area will reduce the ability to improve the frontage of buildings as planning is required for minor works such as rebuilding a falling down wall.	The designation of a conservation area is not designed to prevent change but ensure that it is managed to ensure elements that are identified as special are protected. Minor like for like repairs such as rebuilding a falling wall in a like for like manner would not require any additional approval.

Summary of Responses Received by 30/01/2020

Respondent ID	Name	Organisation	Date Received	Comment ID	Respondent's Comments	Council's Response
				0.04	The proposal does not fit in with the London Plan to increase the density of housing if some of the dilapidated Victorian houses which are in owned and lived in by single occupants are restricted in being converted into flats.	The council is under a statutory duty under s71 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which states "Every local planning authority— (a)shall from time to time determine which parts of their area are areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which it is desirable to preserve or enhance, and (b)shall designate those areas as conservation areas."
BCA84	Tom & Zoe Burnay	N/A	30/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.
BCA85	Jonathan Stopes-Roe	N/A	30/01/20	0.01	In favour of the designation of Brownswood Conservation Area.	Noted.