

Addendum

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 3 June 2019

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8

Reference No: HGY/2019/1143	Ward: Muswell Hill
Address: 1-9 Fortis Green Road	
Proposal: Alterations to existing ground floor shopfronts and excavation of basement level below; erection of three additional storeys on top of the existing ground floor to provide 6 self-contained flats (5x1bed & 1x 3bed).	
Applicant: Acemark Properties	
Ownership: Private	

5. Local Representation Update

Further third party responses received since publish of main report – increased from 134 to 221, including latest comments from the Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association – all in objection.

Para 5.3: (Summary of representations received), under sub-heading 'Design/ impact on the Conservation Area/ Listed Building', **add**;

- *the Council has not followed its statutory obligations with respect to considering impacts on heritage assets*
- *Statement that the proposal does not take account of latest 2019 NPPF guidance about Heritage Assets, notably paras 193-202, instead relying on para 134 of the previous 2012 NPPF and; statement that the 2019 NPPF contains new emphasis (at paragraph 193) on giving of great weight to an asset's conservation when considering the potential harm that the proposed development would do to the heritage asset irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. Statement that the proposal would lead to substantial harm.*

[Officer note: The updated 2019 version of the NPPF should be referenced, however this does not alter the recommendation. In short, the proposal would lead to less than substantial harm, not significant harm as stated above, which would be clearly outweighed by public benefits, as set out in the report.]

(Summary of representations received), under 'Traffic, Parking, Access and Sustainable Transport' **add**;

- *Parking Survey and assessment of proposal omit/erroneously state that the surrounding roads have unrestricted parking when a controlled parking zone was*

recently introduced several months ago. [Officer Note: Relevant section of the officer report amended to take account of this].

(Summary of representations received), under new sub-heading titled 'Basement works',
add;

- *Adjoining properties feature basements which could be affected by works, which is not reflect in the basement impact assessment (BIA).* [Officer note: The information submitted provides sufficient assurances that the works here can be carried out successfully without detrimentally affecting adjoining/ neighbouring properties. This includes if they have adjoining basements/basement party walls. For the reasons set out in the basement impact assessment section of the report, the works are considered acceptable in this regard.]
- *Statement that water table sits 2m below ground level, which is not reflected in the BIA.* [Officer note: The drainage/flooding implications are considered acceptable in the drainage section of the report, including the recommendation for the water pump for the basement. This includes having regard to the comments from Thames Water. This is not unusual for a development, and basements have and continue to be built in areas which can take account of differences in water table levels.]

6. Material Considerations

Para 6.29 (Impact on the Conservation Area): **replace** "134 of the NPPF" with "paragraph 196 of the NPPF (2019)".

Para. 6.47 [Correction] Unit 5 is a 1 bed (2 person) unit. All other figures are correct.

Para. 6.55 (Traffic, Highway Safety, Access, and Sustainable Transport): remove sentence "With the exception of Muswell Hill Broadway, parking in the surrounding roads are unrestricted." **Replace with:** "In addition to restricted parking in Muswell Hill Road, most on-street parking to the west of the site has been restricted by the introduction of a permit controlled parking zone".

Para. 6.57 (Traffic, Highway Safety, Access, and Sustainable Transport): Insert concluding sentence: "Transportation Officers are aware of the recent introduction of a controlled parking zone and its location but do not consider a requirement for car-free restrictions on this development be imposed."

Two further conditions are recommended to ensure the detailing of the façade is of a standard befitting the site's location within the Conservation Area and other heritage assets.

A condition is also recommended in order to provide a level of control over the future use of the commercial units, being that the site is within the District Centre.

Alteration to Recommendation

8.0. As per report, with 2 additional conditions

Condition No.8:

No development shall take place until the following details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:

- i) plan, elevation and section drawings, including jambs, head and cill, of all new external windows and doors with typical glazing bar details, at a scale of 1:20;
- ii) typical elevation detailing at a scale of 1:5;
- iii) plan, elevation and section drawings of the new shopfronts at a scale of 1:20;

Thereafter the development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance for the proposed development, to safeguard the visual amenity of neighbouring properties and the appearance of the locality consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

Condition No.9:

Prior to the occupation of the altered/ extended retail/ commercial floorspace the details of the use and operations of this floorspace shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall only be carried out in accordance with the approved detail.

Reason: In order to restrict the use of the premises to one compatible with the surrounding area because other uses within the same Use Class or another Use Class are not necessarily considered to be acceptable consistent with Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

8.1 In the event that member choose to make a decision contrary to officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEM

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

Item No. 9

Reference No: HGY/2019/0984	Ward: Muswell Hill
Address: 76 Woodland Gardens	
Proposal: Demolition of existing and construction of a new dwellinghouse	
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Evans	
Ownership: Private	

5. Local Representation Update

One further third party objection received; total of 39.

Petition received including 183 signatories (some of which have also written individual letters included in the 39 above). Petition is on objection on grounds of,

“new property...not in keeping with the Edwardian house that it will be directly attached to and the remainder of the Edwardian street where there have been no demolitions in its 107 year history”.