

## LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS 26/11/2013

### REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

**Reference No:** HGY/2013/1282

**Ward:** Crouch End

**Date received:** 07/10/2013

**Drawing number of plans:** 12-0135 PL100B, 12-0135 PL101B, 12-0135 PL102A, PL100 (A), PL101 (B), PL102 (A), PL103 (A), \_PL103 (A), X01, X100 and X102

**Address:** 2-4 The Broadway N8 9SN

**Proposal:** Erection of additional storey to provide 3 self-contained flats.

**Existing Use:** Mixed

**Proposed Use:** Residential

**Applicant:** MrAvi DodiAnglo United Developments

**Ownership:** Private

### PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Conservation Area

Road Network: C Road

**Officer contact:** Aaron Lau

### RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

### SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The application site lies on the eastern side of The Broadway and concerns five x three-storey, terrace properties with crown roof and decorative gable ended front dormers. The ground floor is occupied by commercial units including a public house with residential use above. Access into the upper floor flat is obtained via a communal entrance on Broadway.

The building is contained wholly within Crouch End Conservation Area and Crouch End Restricted Conversion Area. The site also lies within Crouch End Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ).

The adjacent building 1 to 4 Broadway House is a Grade II Listed Building and Former Hornsey Town Hall to the rear within Hatherley Gardens is a Grade II\* Listed Building.

### PLANNING HISTORY:

**Planning Application History**

HGY/2013/1404 - Change of use of basement from ancillary storage (B8) to community (D1) and dance studio (D2). – pending

HGY/2012/2445 - Erection of additional storey to provide 3 x one bed self-contained flats – withdrawn 07/02/2013

HGY/2005/1851 - Amendment to planning application HGY/2005/1060 granted on 20/07/2005 for the conversion and refurbishment of existing upper floors (11 flats) to create 15 self contained flats: 9 x 1 bed and 6 x 2 bed flats. Provision of new entrance to front elevation and alterations to rear elevation. – refused 01/12/2005

HGY/2003/2112 - Part conversion and part rear extension to front block at first, second, and roof level to provide 19 flats. Erection of 4 x 2 storey two bedroom mews houses. – refused 12/01/2004

HGY/1997/0907 - including change of use of adjoining shop unit (No.4) Refurbishment and enlargement of existing bar/A3 operation from A1 to A3, installation of new shopfront over both frontages and mechanical service plant. – approved 05/08/1997

HGY/1995/0492 - Partial change of use of part of ground floor to restaurant with basement as storage. – approved 19/09/1995

OLD/1983/0118 - Conversion of upper floors into 11 self-contained units comprising 8 bed-sit flats, 2 two bed flats and 1 three bed flat. – approved 25/02/1983

### **Planning Enforcement History**

None

### **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

Erection of additional storey to provide 3 self-contained flats.

### **CONSULTATION**

Ward Councillors  
344 adjoining properties  
Hornsey CAAC  
Thames Water

LBH – Transportation  
LBH – Cleansing  
LBH - Building Control  
LBH - Conservation & Design

### **RESPONSES**

Thames Water: No objection subject to informatives.

LBH - Building Control: No comments.

LBH – Cleansing: Objection

*“Adequate waste storage and collection arrangement should be in place to service these 3 self contained flats. Inadequate information is given in the application regarding these matters. Red.”*

#### LBH – Transportation: Objection

*“There is concern that the site falls within the Crouch End Restricted Conversion Area, in view of the existing on-street parking pressure at this location. The Council's adopted UDP (saved policies 2013) Policy HSG11 lists Crouch End as one of the areas where the "majority of properties have been converted into flats and are now experiencing problems of extreme parking pressure and a significant adverse effect on residential amenity". With this in mind we have applied Policy 1.3 of Appendix 1 UDP which requires that the applicant provide three off-street parking spaces for the additional residential units.*

*The creation of further residential units without any off-street parking provision is likely to exacerbate the existing parking pressure at this location and create a situation where the prospective residents of this development persistently seek alternative on-street parking spaces.*

*The applicant is also reminded that the Crouch End (zone A) controlled parking zone available in this area, only operates from Monday to Friday between 10:00am and 12:00noon, hence it cannot offer the sufficient level of parking control that would negate the need for this parking requirement.*

*Therefore, in view of the fact that this development proposal contravenes the UDP Policy HSG11, the highway and transportation authority object to this application”.*

#### LBH - Conservation & Design: Objection

*“The scheme proposes an additional floor to the terrace. This would involve the increase in the roof height with additional dormers placed over existing attic floor. This would materially alter the appearance of the building to the detriment of its architectural integrity. The additional bulk would be visible from long distance views and would ultimately detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is, therefore, unacceptable.*

*Any form of roof addition, including contemporary additions, would alter the appearance of the building and given its prominent location and architectural quality would detract from the conservation area. It would be, therefore, unacceptable in principle”.*

2 letters of support has been received.

3 letter of objections following initial consultation and 4 letters of objection following reconsultation including a joint objection from Councillors Winskill and Strang on the following grounds:

- Overdevelopment;
- Design;
- Parking;

- Refuse;
- Access;
- Loss of outlook

It should be noted that access into the new flats is obtained via the existing communal entrance. The secondary access is for emergency use only. All the other matters raised are material planning considerations and considered in the following report.

## RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

### National Planning Guidance

The National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

- Chapter 4 Promoting sustainable transport;
- Chapter 6 Delivering a wide choice of high quality homes;
- Chapter 7 Requiring good design;
- Chapter 8 Promoting healthy communities;
- Chapter 12 Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

### The London Plan, 2011

- Policy 3.1 Ensuring equal life chances for all;
- Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply;
- Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential;
- Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments;
- Policy 3.8 Housing choice;
- Policy 4.1 Developing London's economy;
- Policy 6.3 Assessing effects of development on transport capacity;
- Policy 6.9 Cycling;
- Policy 6.10 Walking;
- Policy 6.11 Smoothing traffic flow and tackling congestion;
- Policy 6.13 Parking;
- Policy 7.1 Building London's neighbourhoods and communities;
- Policy 7.2 An inclusive environment;
- Policy 7.3 Designing out crime;
- Policy 7.4 Local character;
- Policy 7.5 Public realm;
- Policy 7.6 Architecture;
- Policy 7.8 Heritage assets and archaeology;
- Policy 7.14 Improving air quality; and
- Policy 7.15 Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes

### Haringey Local Plan, 2013

- Policy SP0 Presumption in favour of sustainable development;
- Policy SP1 Managing growth;
- Policy SP2 Housing;
- Policy SP6 Waste and recycling;
- Policy SP7 Transport;
- Policy SP11 Design;
- Policy SP12 Conservation; and

Policy SP14 Health and well-being

Saved Haringey Unitary Development Plan, 2013

Policy UD1 Planning statements;  
Policy UD3 General principles;  
Policy UD7 Waste storage;  
Policy M10 Parking for development; and  
Policy CSV5 Alterations and extensions in Conservation Area

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG1a Design guidance;  
SPG2 Conservation and archaeology;  
SPG4 Access for all – mobility standards;  
SPG5 Safety by design;  
SPG7a Pedestrian & vehicular movement;

Supplementary Planning Document

SPD Housing

Other

London Borough of Haringey – Community Infrastructure Study; and  
Mayor of London ‘London Housing Design Guide’

**ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION**

Principle of development

Local Plan Policy SP0 supports the broad vision of the NPPF, and states that the Council will take a positive approach to reflect the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Permission will be granted by the Council unless any benefits are significantly outweighed by demonstrable harm caused by the proposal.

The NPPF, London Plan Policy 3.3 and Local Plan Policies SP1 and SP2 seek to maximise the supply of additional housing to meet future demand in the borough and London in general. The proposal is for 3 x 1 bed units. The principle of introducing additional residential units would be supported by the Council in meeting the intent of the NPPF, London Plan Policy 3.3 and Local Plan Policies SP1 and SP2, albeit all other material planning considerations are to be met.

Design and Impact on Conservation Area

The Council, under saved UDP Policy CSV5 seek alterations and extensions to buildings within Conservation Areas, to preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area and retain or reinstate characteristic features such as doors, windows or materials of buildings.

Concurrent Local Plan Policy SP11 promotes high quality and attractive places, buildings and landscaping, where the borough’s heritage assets such as conservation areas are

protected under London Plan Policy SP12. This stance aligns to the NPPF and alongside with London Plan Policy 7.8, which identifies heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

The application site at 2-4 The Broadway falls within Crouch End Conservation Area. Nos. 2 & 4 The Broadway are an early 20th Century three storey red brick terrace of five units with an attic floor and dormers in a steep slate roof and a projecting stone eaves cornice. The upper floors are divided vertically into five bays by brick pilasters with corbels at the eaves level and have timber casement windows with coloured glass panes in the upper fanlights and painted stone surrounds. The dormers are set within red brick gables flanked with stone side scrolls. The ground floor has shopfronts with simple stone surrounds and a left side round headed entrance doorway to the upper floors. The left side unit is three windows wide with a ground floor entrance to the upper floors. These buildings are similar in style and materials to the slightly older terraces on the west side of the Broadway and make a positive contribution to the streetscape of this part of the conservation area.

The building is prominently located at the street junction and is highly visible in long distance views from the adjacent streets.

The proposal is for an additional floor effectively increasing the overall height of the building and resulting in a four-storey development. This is deemed unacceptable as it would increase the disparity between storey heights of the adjacent two and three-storey buildings. It would further add significant massing and bulk to the roof to make it appear 'top heavy', and therefore upsetting the visual coherence and balance of the building. Hence, the principle of the roof addition is not supported by Officers.

The architectural detailing is also considered poor. The double dormer fails to coordinate with the existing gable ended front dormers and they detract from the architectural characteristics of the existing building. Overall, the proposal is judged to be harmful to the conservation area and the setting of the adjacent listed building and thus be contrary to the NPPF, London Plan Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8, Local Plan Policies SP11 and SP12, saved UDP Policies UD3 and CSV5 and SPG1a 'Design guidance' and SPG2 'Conservation and archaeology'.

### Impact on Residential Amenity

#### *Daylight/sunlight and privacy*

Saved UDP Policy UD3 states that development proposals are required to demonstrate that there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity or other surrounding uses in terms of loss of daylight or sunlight, privacy, overlooking. Similarly London Plan Policy 7.6 requires buildings and structures should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy.

The roof development is situated in a part of a terrace within The Broadway so as to not incur any loss of residential amenity to the neighbouring properties at No. 6 The Broadway and No. 148 Crouch Hill. The site abuts the rear gardens of Hatherley Gardens to the east. The living conditions in terms of outlook and daylight/sunlight, currently enjoyed by occupiers of these residential units will be maintained as the roof addition will be reasonably distanced away from these properties.

In terms of direct overlooking effects to the properties within Hatherley Gardens, Section 8.21 of the Council’s SPD ‘Housing’ states that, “*All rear facing habitable rooms directly opposite one another should be a minimum of 20 metres apart for two storey developments...and additional 10 metres is required for each additional storey*”. In this instance, the minimum recommendation between the rear windows of the fourth storey roof addition and the two-storey properties on Hatherley Gardens would be 40 metres. The actual horizontal distance between properties would be approximately 27 metres. Although this is under the desired requirement, the rear windows of the roof addition are unlikely to give rise to a significant degree of loss of privacy to residents of Hatherley Gardens as opposite windows will be oblique, and these properties are currently overlooked by existing windows which are closer to the units of Hatherley Gardens.

*Noise and disturbance*

Noise pollution is dealt with under saved UDP Policy UD3 which resists developments which would involve an unacceptable level of noise beyond the boundary of the site. This stance aligns to the NPPF and with London Plan Policy 7.15 and Policy SP14 of Haringey’s Local Plan. The site fronting The Broadway has significant ambient background noise due to high number of vehicle and pedestrian movements during the day and night. This being the case, the additional three occupants attending the site is unlikely to cause any significant noise and disturbance impacts upon adjoining properties.

Quality of Accommodation

London Plan Policy 3.5 and accompanying London Housing Design Guide set out the space standards for all new residential developments to ensure an acceptable level of living accommodation offered.

London Plan Requirement	Proposed unit size	Compliance?
Unit A - 1 bed 1 person studio - 37 sqm	46.1 sqm	Yes
Unit B - 1 bed 1 person studio - 37 sqm	43.7 sqm	Yes
Unit C - 1 bed 1 person studio - 37 sqm	45.8 sqm	Yes

In assessing the proposal against the above requirements, all the studio one bed units would accord with the minimum unit size requirements to result in an acceptable level of residential accommodation for future occupiers of the new development.

Access and Parking

The site falls within Crouch End Restricted Conversion Area and also within an area as suffering from high parking pressures.

Appendix 1 of the Haringey UDP sets a maximum number of car parking for developments within restricted conversion areas: 1 space per unit for 1 bedroom unit. The proposal provides no off-street parking spaces and would therefore exacerbate existing parking pressures within the surrounding streets to the detriment of local amenity. In addition, the Council cannot consider a car-free development at this site as the CPZ hours only operates from Monday to Friday between 10:00 and 12:00.

The Council is unable to ascertain as to whether the existing refuse storage has the capacity to store additional waste associated with the new developments. The proposal would therefore lead to refuse bins being stored over the adjacent highway which would prejudice the safe and free flow of pedestrian traffic along this section of The Broadway contrary to London Plan Policy 6.10 and Local Plan Policy SP7.

### Accessibility

The proposal will be required to comply with Lifetime Homes Standards and Approved Document M of the Building Regulations (ADM). The Design and Access Statement and supporting documents need to set out the applicant's proposals and commitment to inclusive design in accordance with London Plan Policies 3.5, 3.8, 7.2 and 7.6 and Local Plan Policy SP2.

The entrance door of the individual units will achieve the minimum 800mm LTH requirement to facilitate ease of entry for disabled users. The entrance door of Unit A fails to have a min. 300mm leading edge on the pull side, but this can be easily remedied by flipping the door hinge on the opposite end. The bathrooms are reasonably laid out and the nature of the studios means an open plan layout with good circulation spaces. On balance, the applicant has demonstrated the new development has been inclusively designed to meet the needs of the wider community and therefore be in accordance to London Plan Policies 3.5, 3.8, 7.2 and 7.6 and Local Plan Policy SP2.

### **CIL APPLICABLE**

The Mayoral CIL has been in effect since 1st April 2012 in accordance with Regulation 25 (a) of the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 (as amended). The collection of Mayoral CIL will help contribute towards the funding of Cross Rail. According to the Mayoral CIL charging schedule, the proposal would be liable to Mayor CIL at a rate of £35 per square metre.

The estimated Mayor CIL for the proposal should planning permission be granted is £7,245 (£35/sqm x 207 sqm).

### **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The proposed roof extension, by reason of its size, scale and prominent location, would be out of keeping with the design and character of the existing building, and would have adverse effect on the appearance of the property and the visual amenity of the conservation area as a whole.

The proposed development within a restricted conversion area provides no car parking and would be likely therefore to exacerbate significantly the current on-street parking situation thereby prejudicing the safety and free flow of traffic in the area and promoting unacceptable parking stress.

The proposed development, by reason of the absence of adequate refuse accommodation, would result in the refuse bins being stored over the highway which would give rise to conditions which would prejudice the free flow of pedestrians along the neighbouring highway.



## RECOMMENDATION

### REFUSE PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2013/1282

Applicant's drawing No.(s) 12-0135 PL100B, 12-0135 PL101B, 12-0135 PL102A, PL100 (A), PL101 (B), PL102 (A), PL103 (A), \_PL103 (A), X01, X100 and X102

For the following reason(s)

1. The proposed roof extension, by reason of its size, scale and prominent location, would be out of keeping with the design and character of the existing building, and would have adverse effect on the appearance of the property and the visual amenity of the conservation area as a whole, contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, March 2012 and to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2011, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, Saved Policies UD3 and CSV5 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and inconsistent with the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1a 'Design guidance' and SPG2 'Conservation and archaeology'.
2. The proposed development within a restricted conversion area provides no car parking and would be likely therefore to exacerbate significantly the current on-street parking situation thereby prejudicing the safety and free flow of traffic in the area and promoting unacceptable parking stress. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy 6.13 of the London Plan 2011, Saved Policies UD3 and M10 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.
3. The proposed development, by reason of the absence of adequate refuse accommodation, would result in the refuse bins being stored over the highway which would give rise to conditions which would prejudice the free flow of pedestrians along the neighbouring highway, would be contrary to Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy 6.10 the London Plan 2011 and Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013.