

Felicity Foley, Acting
Committees Manager

020 8489 2919

felicity.foley@haringey.gov.uk

02 September 2019

To: All Members of the Planning Sub Committee

Dear Member,

Planning Sub Committee - Monday, 9th September, 2019

I attach a copy of the following report for the above-mentioned meeting which were not available at the time of collation of the agenda:

9. HGY/2019/1814 - 76 WOODLAND GARDENS (PAGES 1 - 24)

Yours sincerely

Felicity Foley, Acting Committees Manager
Principal Committee Co-Ordinator

This page is intentionally left blank

Planning Sub Committee 9th September 2019

Item No.

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2019/1814

Ward: Muswell Hill

Address: 76 Woodland Gardens N10 3UB

Proposal: Construction of a new family dwelling (with retention of existing front façade)

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Evans

Ownership: Private

Case Officer Contact: Roland Sheldon

Date received: 26/06/2019 **Last amended date:** 22/08/2019

- Revisions were made to the design of the western (side elevation)

1.1 The application has generated significant public interest. The Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee has requested the application to be determined by the Planning Sub-Committee.

SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 1.2 There have been four previous planning applications for this site for the demolition of the existing and erection of a replacement dwelling, the first of which was withdrawn. The other three applications were refused permission on design grounds with planning application ref: HGY/2017/3650 dismissed on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate following an appeal for non-determination. The last planning application sought to address the reasons for refusal cited by the Planning Inspector, but equally was refused on design ground (ref. HGY/2019/0984) by the Planning sub-Committee on 03/06/19. Specifically, it was found that the detailed design of that scheme, notably its glazing style and lack of general detailing, was not an acceptable architectural response for the site and the character of the area.
- 1.3 Officers consider the current application adequately addresses these design concerns by proposing to retain the original front façade of the house. The impact of the development on residential amenities of neighbouring properties remains acceptable.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management is authorised to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives.
- 2.2 That delegated authority be granted to the Head of Development Management or the Assistant Director Planning to make any alterations, additions or deletions to the recommended heads of terms and/or recommended conditions as set out in this report and to further delegate this power provided this authority shall be exercised in consultation with the Chairman (or in their absence the Vice-Chairman) of the Sub-Committee.
- 2.3 That, following completion of the agreement(s) referred to in resolution (2.1) within the time period provided for in resolution (2.2) above, planning permission be granted in accordance with the Planning Application subject to the attachment of the conditions.

Conditions (the full text of recommended conditions is contained in section 9 of this report)

- 1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
- 2) In accordance with approved plans
- 3) Material details submitted for approval
- 4) Details of front boundary treatment/ landscaping to the front and measures to screen refuse and recycling bins
- 5) Obscure glazing
- 6) Suitably qualified chartered engineer to monitor the critical elements
- 7) Removal of permitted development rights for extensions, alterations and outbuildings
- 8) Construction management and logistics plan
- 9) Method statement for façade retention

Informatives

- 1) Land ownership
 - 2) Hours of construction
 - 3) Party Wall Act
 - 4) CIL liable
 - 5) Crossover
- 2.5 In the event that Members choose to make a decision contrary to Officers' recommendation members will need to state their reasons.

CONTENTS

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND SITE LOCATION DETAILS
4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE
5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS
6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS
7. COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY
8. RECOMMENDATION
9. PLANNING CONDITIONS & INFORMATIVES

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: Consultation responses from internal and external agencies

Appendix 2: Plans and images

3.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

- 3.1 The proposal is for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a replacement two-storey dwellinghouse with basement level and accommodation within the roofspace. The proposed dwelling would have four bedrooms and a home-office located on the first and second floors and an open-plan living space at ground floor level. The development also includes a basement floor which would have a gym and playroom space along with a workshop area.
- 3.2 The new dwelling would be built behind the existing façade, including the existing stonework/mouldings to the windows. Replacement timber double glazed windows to match the existing would be installed alongside a replacement front door matching the design of the existing. The new sloping roofs would be finished in slate tiles. Similar to the previous applications the side and rear elevations would be of contemporary design with the side (western) elevation having a gable end with a large element of 'hit and miss' brickwork.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.3 The subject site contains a two-storey Edwardian semi-detached dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Woodland Gardens. Surrounding development is characterised by similar houses mainly rows of terraces built during the Edwardian period of the early 20th century (1901 - 1910). To the rear of the site is more recently constructed housing - Teresa Walk and Connaught Gardens. The application site is not located in a conservation area.
- 3.4 The brickwork on all elevations of the building have been painted white, as well as the cills and lintels. The property has timber framed windows as well as a slate roof. Like its neighbours, the house is 'double fronted' with a bay to one side. In this case, a full height projecting bay with gable feature to the left, which is infilled with 'half timbering' and render. The bay feature also has a ground floor octagonal bay window.
- 3.5 As noted the street is predominantly characterised by terraced dwellings, built during the Edwardian period of the early 20th century. No 74 to the immediate west of the site is however detached as well as the application site and No 78, as such deviating from the more predominant character of terrace housing.
- 3.6 The site is steeply sloped, with Woodland Gardens rising steeply to its west. The western boundary of the site is located adjacent to the garden of No 74, which unlike the majority of properties within the street, is located to the side of the dwelling. The street curves northwards beyond No 74, after which point the character of the street is consistently defined by terraced properties with prominent bay windows and gabled roofs facing the street.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

3.7 Planning history:

HGY/2017/2490: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2-storey (with basement level) dwellinghouse – Withdrawn 18/12/2017

HGY/2017/3650: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement 2-storey (with basement level) dwellinghouse – Appealed for non-determination. The Inspector dismissed the appeal on issues regarding the design merits of the scheme.

HGY/2018/0913: Prior notification for demolition of house – Prior Approval Not Required 06/04/2018

HGY/2018/1494 - Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of a new family dwelling. – Refused 05/07/2018

The form, design and detailing of the proposed dwelling would fail to make an acceptable architectural response to the site, and would fail to respect local context and character. The proposal is therefore contrary to design policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, policy DM1 of the Haringey DPD 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

HGY/2019/0984 - Demolition of existing and construction of a new dwellinghouse – Refused 10/06/2019

The proposed replacement dwelling, by way of its detailed design, specifically glazing style and lack of general detailing, would fail to make an acceptable architectural response to the site and would fail to respect local context and character. This is contrary to design policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017 and the NPPF.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- LBH Transportation
- LBH Building Control
- LBH Design
- Thames Water Utilities
- London Fire Brigade - Fire Safety Regulation

The following responses were received:

- 1) London Fire Brigade: - Are satisfied with the proposal.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 33

Objecting: 33

Supporting: 0

Others: 0

- 5.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- The Woodland Conservation Area Action Group: The retention of the front of the building is an improvement. However, the western elevation is out of character with its surroundings. There is excessive glazing on the rear elevation.
- Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association: The choice of brick for side extension should replicate the brick of the current building. The removal of the chimney on the west elevation removes a visual stop to the run of buildings. The southern elevation amounts to overdevelopment and will result in issues of overlooking.
- Muswell Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee: The brickwork of the west elevation should match that of the existing front façade (after removal of the white paint) and that of the opposite wall of No. 74. The loss of the chimney is regrettable.

- 5.3 The issues raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application are set out in Appendix 1 and summarised as follows:

- The design of the proposal would harm the Edwardian character of the locality;
- Loss of privacy;
- Impact of demolition and rebuild would have on structural integrity on neighbouring properties and nearby infrastructure;
- Detrimental impact of demolition on highway conditions.

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 The main planning issues raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development;
2. Design and appearance;
3. Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;

4. Quality of Residential Accommodation;
5. Accessibility;
6. Parking and highway safety;
7. Basement development;
8. Waste and Recycling;
9. Impact on trees.

Principle of the development

Demolition

- 6.2 There is no measure of protection afforded to the demolition of a house (unless listed, a Scheduled Ancient Monument or within a Conservation Area), other than the requirement for 'prior approval' (for method of demolition and restoration of the site) before demolition can occur.
- 6.3 In this case, the applicant has given prior notification for demolition under application ref: HGY/2018/0913, and the submitted details regarding method of construction were deemed by Building Control to be adequate for the purposes of the application. Prior approval was therefore not required (06/04/2018). The dwelling can therefore be demolished at any time.
- 6.4 It is accepted that the existing dwelling is in a reasonably poor condition, with signs of visible subsidence or slippage of the existing structure, as well as having unsympathetic alterations. As such, the applicant has pursued a scheme for demolition and replacement with a contemporary house whilst retaining the front façade.
- 6.5 Such an approach is also reflected in policy DM1 of the adopted Development Management DPD, which requires that all new development 'achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character of the area relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole'.

Possible Conservation Area designation

- 6.6 A number of the third party representations received refer to how the area is under review to be considered designating as a conservation area. It is accepted that such a request has been made, however the site is not currently designated a conservation area and as such the application must be dealt with on the basis of this current position. Even however it was a conservation areas there is not a bar on demolition and replacement of buildings, as each building would be assessed in terms of its value and contribution to a conservation area, and the impact on the replacement on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Design and appearance

- 6.7 London Plan Policy 7.4 emphasises the importance of considering local character as part of design quality, with planning decisions being informed by the surrounding historic environment and human scale. Policy 7.6 recognises the role that development can have on streetscape and requires a building to be appropriate to context and comprise details and materials that complement, but not necessarily replicate local architecture. This policy also highlights the importance of proportion, scale, composition and orientation, as factors which should inform design quality.
- 6.8 Local Plan Policy SP11 states that all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create places and buildings that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use and contribute to a sense of place. Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires that new development achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character of an area and relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole.
- 6.9 The established character of Woodland Gardens is Edwardian with features such as porches with sloping tile roofs, traditional bay windows, timber framed sash/casement windows etc. being largely left intact/ unaltered and informing its character. This high degree of architectural consistency lessens however, along the curve in street, beyond (east of) the junction with Connaught Gardens.
- 6.10 Looking at the 'Haringey Urban Character Study' (2015), it is accepted that the houses on Woodland Gardens share similar characteristics with other housing stock in Muswell Hill. Houses in this area are defined by uniform front gardens, typically low clinker wall, densely planted front gardens, tile paved front paths, handsome intricate front doors, a variety of elaborate detail in stone and stucco etc. as well as the predominance of red brick; all of which are important to its character.
- 6.11 The site is located adjacent to a detached dwelling (No 74) to its immediate west, with a substantial side garden plot adjacent to the western elevation of the application site. The host building is semi-detached and linked to No 78. As such, this pair of semis and the detached house do deviate slightly from the more consistent Edwardian terrace arrangement, which primarily informs the character of the street.
- 6.12 The site is located at a steep and visually prominent junction in the street, beyond which the street curves sharply northwards adjacent to the side garden of No 74. This means that clear views of the front and side (western) elevations are available from the east and the west of the site.
- 6.13 As outlined above there have been four previous planning applications for this site, involving demolition and the erection of a replacement dwelling. These

various applications have been refused on design grounds with planning application ref: HGY/2017/3650 dismissed on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate following an appeal for non-determination. The last planning application sought to address the reasons for refusal cited by a Planning Inspector, but equally was refused on design ground (ref. HGY/2019/0984) by the Council's Planning Committee on 03/06/19. In specific, it was viewed that the detailed design of this scheme, specifically its glazing style and lack of general detailing, failed to be an acceptable architectural response for the site and the character of the area.

- 6.14 Officers consider that the current proposal overcomes the design concerns raised, as importantly, the existing frontage including the ornate detailing of stonework surrounds, would be retained and repaired where necessary. As such the house as viewed from the street will be consistent in appearance and scale with the remainder of the street. The only differences being the loss of the chimney stacks and the conversion of the hipped roof to gable (such conversion has been undertaken next door and is permitted development).
- 6.15 The existing windows to the front elevation would be replaced with like-for-like timber double glazed sash units; which would have the same external glazing bar detail as the current windows. A replacement front door would also be installed that would match the design of the existing. The applicant's agent advises suitable protection of the façade is possible during the construction and a condition will be imposed requiring a detailed method statement to be submitted prior to the commencement of works on site showing how the front façade will be retained and protected during construction.
- 6.16 The proposed front elevation is annotated indicating that the existing clinker/ front wall will be retained and extended using matching materials. Further details regarding the front boundary treatment and soft landscaping are required to be submitted to the LPA prior to the commencement of works on site, as secured by way of a condition.
- 6.17 The western (side) and southern (rear) elevations of the last application (ref: HGY/2019/0984) are very similar in design to the current scheme. With the exception of a slightly enlarged proportion of glazing on the first and second floors elevations, the design of the rear/ southern elevation is the same as the previous scheme. While the flank elevation would not slavishly copy the existing flank elevation, the overall scheme is not considered to detract from the character and appearance of the area.
- 6.18 Officers consider the form, design and detailing of the resulting dwelling to be an acceptable architectural response to the site sensitive to its surroundings. Further details in relation to materials (including brick, tiles and window frames) are required to be submitted to the LPA prior to the commencement of works on site.

- 6.19 The proposal meets the requirements of policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, policy DM1 of the Haringey DPD 2017 and the NPPF.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

- 6.20 London Plan policy 7.6 in part states that buildings should not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings, particularly residential buildings, in relation to privacy, overshadowing and other matters. Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires an appropriate protection of privacy to neighbouring properties.
- 6.21 The siting, bulk, massing and height of the replacement dwelling would not adversely affect outlook or sunlight/daylight enjoyed by the occupants of neighbouring properties or lead to overshadowing.
- 6.22 The ground and first floor of the proposed dwelling would not project beyond the rear extent of linked property No. 78, with the exception of the first floor projection on its western end. The siting, width and depth of this projection would not materially impact light or outlook to neighbouring occupiers.
- 6.23 Objections have been received in regard to the expanse of glazing proposed at second and first floor level on the rear elevation. The rear windows of No 7 Teresa Walk, located to the back of the application site, are approximately 16 metres away from the first floor windows of the existing dwelling. The proposed development would bring a first floor window into closer proximity. However, this window would be treated with obscure glazing and would serve a bathroom.
- 6.24 The current proposal has more glazing on the rear elevation at the second floor level, compared with the previous applications. However, this additional pane of glazing does not project any further rearwards than the other elements of glazing included at second floor level. As such, the inclusion of this additional element of second floor rear glazing would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupants of properties on Theresa Walk.
- 6.25 A triangular pane of glazing would be included in the western elevation of the building at second floor level. However, 'hit-and-miss' brickwork applied to the western elevation of the building would largely conceal outlook from this window. Notwithstanding that outlook from the window would be limited, there are no side windows on the existing building. The rear garden of No. 74 Woodland Gardens would be in close proximity to this window, and the flank elevation of No. 74 has first and second floor windows are orientated in the direction of this window. In order to ensure that its inclusion does not result in a loss of privacy, a restrictive condition will be imposed requiring it to be obscure-glazed and non-opening, unless above 1.7 metres in height when measured from floor level of the room in which it is located.

- 6.26 As the site has a shallow rear garden and to ensure that any future addition do not lead to excessive site coverage or affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, permitted development rights (specifically under Classes A, B and E) are being removed as part of the grant of planning permission.
- 6.27 Overall, it can be demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents; and the Council and Planning Inspectorate has not found harm to neighbouring amenity with previous applications. As such, the scheme is considered to be in accordance with the policies outlined above.

Quality of Residential Accommodation

- 6.28 London Plan (2016) policy 3.5 requires the design of all new housing developments to enhance the quality of local places and for the dwellings in particular to be of sufficient size and quality. Local Plan (2017) Strategic Policy SP2 and Policy DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017 reinforce this approach. The Mayor's Housing SPG sets out the space standards for new residential developments to ensure an acceptable level of living accommodation is offered.
- 6.29 The proposed new dwelling would have a basement level occupying the full footprint which would contain a utility room, workshop, gym and playroom. The kitchen/living room areas would be located at ground floor level with 4 bedrooms and home-office within the first and loft floor levels.
- 6.30 The dwelling would have a floorspace in excess of 300 sqm and therefore would comfortably exceed the 121sqm required for a 4-bedroom 3-storey 7-person dwelling. All habitable rooms would benefit from a satisfactory standard of outlook and access to natural light.

Accessibility

- 6.31 The NPPF and London Plan policies 3.8 and 7.2 and Local Plan policy SP2 require all development proposals to provide satisfactory access for disabled people and those with mobility difficulties such as parents with pushchairs and young children. All residential units should be built in accordance with Lifetime Homes Standards (LTH) and Part M of the Building Regulations to ensure any new housing development is suitable for the disabled users.
- 6.32 The applicant in its Design and Access Statement has confirmed the scheme has been designed to be in general compliance with the 16 criteria standards laid out by Lifetime Homes (LTH). The effective door width of the entrance and internal doors and staircase would accord with the minimum provisions of LTH, and a level and covered approach has been provided for at the entrance. A level entry

WC and access to the living space, albeit via the side entrance to the dwelling, and space is available to provide an entrance level bed-space. Although a potential through-floor lift has not been identified on the plans, the dwelling is capable of being adapted in the future to accommodate one. In short, the applicant has demonstrated that the new residential unit has been inclusively design to LTH standards and would meet the requirements of the wider community in accordance to the above policy framework. The proposed dwelling would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupants.

Parking and highway safety

- 6.33 Local Plan (2017) Policy SP7 Transport states that the Council aims to tackle climate change, improve local place shaping and public realm, and environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking and cycling and seeking to locate major trip generating developments in locations with good access to public transport. This is supported by DM Policy (2017) DM31 'Sustainable Transport'.
- 6.34 The site is located in an area with low public transport accessibility (PTAL) level 1b, and is not located within a controlled parking zone. One off-street parking space is proposed which may not meet parking demand arising from a 4/5-bed dwelling in a low PTAL area, but any additional parking required could be accommodated on street, where there is sufficient capacity. There is currently no crossover providing access to where the proposed off-street parking space would be located as shown on the submitted plans, but the site is not located on a classified road, and therefore planning permission is not required for the formation of a vehicular access into the site. An informative will be included that advises the applicant to apply to the Borough's Highways Department to undertake the works to form the vehicular cross over at their expense.
- 6.35 A total of 3 x cycle parking spaces are provided at ground floor level which is an acceptable level of provision to meet London Plan Standards. A Construction Management and Logistics Plan would also be required for approval prior to the commencement of works on site, to ensure the construction works would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the free flow of traffic, highway and pedestrian safety or upon the amenities of neighbouring occupants in the locality.
- 6.36 Subject to compliance with a condition regarding Construction Logistics Plan, the proposal is acceptable with regards to highways and transportation considerations.

Basement Impact Assessment

- 6.37 Policy DM18 of the Development Management DPD states that householder extensions to existing basements, and the construction of new basements, including in existing dwellings will only be permitted where it can be

demonstrated that the proposal does not adversely affect the structural stability of the building, does not increase in flood risk to the host or nearby properties and does not cause harm to the appearance or setting of the property or the established character of the surrounding area.

- 6.38 A Basement Impact Assessment (including desk study and ground investigation) has been submitted with this application. Whilst not submitted as part of this application, a Structural Engineering Report (prepared by AMA Consulting Engineers) has been submitted alongside the previous planning applications. Given that the bulk, scale, massing and size of basement with the current development is nearly identical to the previous schemes, it is considered reference can be made to the previous engineering report as part of the assessment of the basement development.
- 6.39 The site is underlain by solid deposits of London Clay Formation. The information submitted indicates that there are no detailed river entries or surface water features reported within 250m of the site and equally no Environment Agency Zone 2 or Zone 3 flood zones within 250m of the site. The overall assessment of the site is that the creation of a basement will not adversely impact the site or its immediate environs, providing measures are taken to protect surrounding land and properties during construction. The report says it is unlikely that groundwater would be encountered during site works, but that any encountered groundwater could be readily dealt with by conventional pumping from a sump.
- 6.40 The Structural Engineering Report outlined that contiguous piles would be used to construct the basement. The existing party wall would be underpinned at the start of the works, to ensure that the party wall foundation is not undermined during the excavation works. A movement joint would be incorporated in the party wall design.
- 6.41 Overall, such works do not represent a significant structural stability hazard, on the grounds of using industry standard construction sequence. While it is recognised that certain aspects of the works here cannot be determined absolutely at the planning stage (i.e. works to the party walls), the information submitted to the LPA to date, do provide assurances that the works can be carried out successfully without affecting adjoining/ neighbouring properties.
- 6.42 More detailed drawings, specification and method statement would be prepared in advance of the works being carried out for the purpose of Building Control and party wall agreements. The structural integrity of the proposed basement works would need to satisfy modern day building regulations and the necessary party-wall agreements with the adjoining owner would need to be in place prior to the commencement of works on site.

- 6.43 The information provided has been assessed and is considered satisfactory. A condition shall be imposed to ensure that the structural side of the basement is overseen by a suitably qualified chartered engineer.
- 6.44 In conclusion and subject to compliance with the condition referred to above, Officers are satisfied that the development here can be carried out without impacting land stability, ground water conditions or the amenity of adjoining/neighbouring residents.

Waste and Recycling

- 6.45 London Plan Policy 5.16 indicates the Mayor is committed to reducing waste and facilitating a step change in the way in which waste is managed. Local Plan Policy SP6 Waste and Recycling and DPD Policy DM4, requires development proposals make adequate provision for waste and recycling storage and collection.
- 6.46 The proposed ground floor plan indicates that waste and recycling storage would be provided behind the front boundary wall. Details of the design of such storage and measures to screen such bins would be secured by of a condition prior to occupation of the new dwelling.

Impact on Trees

- 6.47 DM policy (2017) DM1 states the Council will expect development proposals to response to trees on and close to the site. The supporting text of Local Plan Policy SP13 recognises the importance trees can play in improving environmental conditions and improving people's quality of life, and generally seeks the protection, management and maintenance of existing trees.
- 6.48 The site is not subject to any Tree Preservation Orders (TPO) and is not located within a conservation area. There is a grouping of trees subject to a TPO to the south of the site on land adjacent to Theresa Walk, but the development is not located close enough to have any impact on these trees.
- 6.49 There are trees located on/adjacent to the southern boundary of the site that provide screening and visual amenity value between the site and properties to the south on Theresa Walk. Part of the Construction Management Plan condition could include a requirement to ensure building materials or storage do not take place in close proximity to these trees.

Conclusion

- 6.50 Officers consider the current application adequately addresses the design concerns raised in relation to the previous applications for the site. The main bulk of the house as viewed from the street will be largely consistent in

appearance, scale and design with the current building on site. The resulting house would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation and would lead to unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents.

- 6.51 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

CIL

- 7 Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £9,660 (161 sqm x £60 x 1) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £52,989.93 (161 sqm x £265 x 1.242). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

GRANT PERMISSION subject to 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 accordance with the following approved plans and specifications:

Design and Access Statement June 2019 by MacArchitect, 1703.A-00-001-13, 1703.A-03-112-01-13, 1703.A-03-112-02 – 13, 1703.A-03-122-01 – 13, 1703.A-03-122-03 – 13, 1703.A-03-122-04 – 13, 1703.A-03-122-05 – 13, Desk Study, ground Investigation & Basement Impact Assessment Report P1009J1121 18 July 2017, 1703.A-03-112-03 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-114-01 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-114-02 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-114-03 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-122-02 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-132-01 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-132-02 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-132-03 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-132-04 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-132-05 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-133-01 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-133-02 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-133-03 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-133-04 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-133-05 – 14 Rev. C, 1703A-03-133-0614 rev. C, 1703.A-03-133-07 – 14 rev. C, 1703.A-03-133-08 – 14 rev. C

Reason: In order to avoid doubt and in the interests of good planning.

3. No development shall take place until the following details of the buildings hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, including:
 - a) Sample panels of proposed brickwork to be used showing the colour, texture, bond, and pointing;
 - b) All windows and entrance door detailing including materials, profile, reveal depth;
 - c) Roofing material and stone corbel overhang;
 - d) Pre-cast stone used for front bay and projecting front gable

Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the exact materials to be used for the proposed development and to assess the suitability of the samples submitted in the interests of visual amenity consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

4. Prior to the occupation of the development hereby permitted details of boundary treatment along the frontage of the site, measures to screen refuse and recycling bins and landscaping to the frontage of the site shall be submitted to, approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved detail.

Reason: In the interest of public safety and security and to protect the visual amenity of the locality consistent with Policies 3.5, 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

5. Prior to first occupation of the development, the second floor window in the west elevation serving the bedroom 5 (as shown on plan no. 1703.A-03-132-04 - 14 C) shall be obscure glazed and non-opening unless over 1.7 metres in height when measured from the floor level of the room in which it is located. The first floor rear window serving the bathroom (as shown on plan no. 1703.A-03-132-03 - 14 C) shall be fitted with obscured glazing and thereafter permanently retained in that condition thereafter.

Reason: To avoid overlooking into the adjoining properties and to comply with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

6. The development hereby approved shall not commence until such time as a suitably qualified chartered engineer with membership of the appropriate professional body has been appointed to inspect, approve and monitor the critical elements of both permanent and temporary basement construction works

throughout their duration to ensure compliance with the design which has been checked and approved by a building control body. Details of the appointment and the appointee's responsibilities shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Any subsequent change or reappointment shall be confirmed forthwith and retained for the duration of the construction works.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance and structural stability of neighbouring buildings and the character of the immediate area.

7. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (and any order revoking and re-enacting the order) no extensions or outbuildings shall be built and no new window or door openings inserted into any elevation of the buildings (other than that development expressly authorised by this planning permission) etc. shall be carried out without the grant of planning permission having first been obtained from the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard the visual amenities of the area and to prevent overdevelopment of the site by controlling proposed extensions and alterations consistent with Policy 7.4 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

8. No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management and Logistics Plan, to include details of:
 - a) a programme of works with specific information on the timing of deliveries to the site to minimise disruption to traffic and pedestrians on Woodland Gardens,
 - b) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
 - c) provision of boundary hoardings behind any visibility zones;
 - d) wheel washing facilities.

have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Only the approved details shall be implemented and retained during the demolition and construction period. Thereafter, the approved construction plan shall be fully implemented and adhered to during the construction phase of the development.

9. Prior to any work commencing on site, a Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority providing details of the proposed methods to be set in place to ensure retention of the front façade. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with such approved details.

Reason: In order to retain control over the external appearance of the development and in the interest of the visual amenity of the area, consistent with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

INFORMATIVE: In dealing with this application, Haringey Council has implemented the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) (Amendment No.2) Order 2012 to foster the delivery of sustainable development in a positive and proactive manner.

INFORMATIVE: CIL

Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £9, 660 (161 sqm x £60 x 1) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £52, 989.93 (161 sqm x £265 x 1.242). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

INFORMATIVE:

Hours of Construction Work: The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

- 8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday
- 8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday
- and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act: The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.

INFORMATIVE: Any necessary works to construct the crossover will be carried out by the Highways Department at the applicant's expense once all the necessary internal site works have been completed. The applicant should telephone 020 8489 1000 to obtain a cost estimate and to arrange for the works to be carried out.

Appendix 1 Consultation Responses from internal and external agencies


Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
INTERNAL		
Transportation		
EXTERNAL		
	The Woodland Conservation Area Action Group: The retention of the front of the building is an improvement. However, the western elevation is out of character with its surroundings. There is excessive glazing on the rear elevation.	The design and character merits of the proposal are addressed in the Design and Appearance section of the report between paragraphs 6.8 – 6.22.
	Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association: The choice of brick for side extension should replicate the brick of the current building. The removal of the chimney on the west elevation removes a visual stop to the run of buildings. The southern elevation amounts to overdevelopment and will result in issues of overlooking.	The design and character merits of the proposal are addressed in the Design and Appearance section of the report between paragraphs 6.8 – 6.22. A condition has been included requiring samples of materials to be submitted prior to commencement of works on site. This issue of impact on privacy is addressed at paragraphs 6.26 – 6.29.
	Muswell Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee: The brickwork of the west elevation should match that of the existing front façade (after removal of the white paint) and that of the opposite wall of No. 74. The loss of the chimney is regrettable.	The design and character merits of the proposal are addressed in the Design and Appearance section of the report between paragraphs 6.8 – 6.22. A condition has been included requiring samples of materials to be submitted prior to commencement of works on site.
NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES		
	The design of the proposal would harm the Edwardian	This issue is addressed at paragraphs 6.15

Stakeholder	Question/Comment	Response
	character of the locality	– 6.21.
	Loss of privacy	This issue is addressed at paragraphs 6.26 – 6.29.
	Impact of demolition and rebuild would have on structural integrity on neighbouring properties and nearby infrastructure	This issue is addressed at paragraphs 6.39 – 6.46
	Detrimental impact of demolition on highway conditions	This issue is addressed at paragraphs 6.35 – 6.38

Appendix 2 Plans and Images



Site location plan



Aerial view of the site



Site photo – frontage of current dwelling on site



Site photo – rear of the site, (photo taken from neighbouring no. 78 Woodland Gardens)



Visual impression of the proposed frontage.



Site layout/ Ground floor