

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE

Reference No: HGY/2009/1769

Ward: Crouch End

Date received: 19/10/2009

Last amended date: N / A

Drawing number of plans: PL01 - PL05 incl.

Address: Land rear of 27 - 47 Cecile Park N8

Proposal: Conservation Area Consent for demolition of 32 existing lock-up garages and erection of 4 x 2 / 3 storey three bedroom houses with associated landscaping and 8 parking spaces

Existing Use: Garages

Proposed Use: Residential

Applicant: Mithril Homes

Ownership: Private

PLANNING DESIGNATIONS

Conservation area

Road Network: Borough Road

Officer Contact: John Ogenga P'Lakop

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

Approximately 40 lock-up garages currently occupy the site. The garages are situated along the southern boundary of the site. Vehicle access is gained between numbers 37 and 39 Cecile Park. Much of the site is gravelled. The site is within The Crouch End Conservation Area; the southern edge of the site forms the boundary of the Conservation Area.

PLANNING HISTORY

9 applications for the erection of lock up garages were submitted between 1967 and 1984 with the most significant being the granting of permission for 39 garages in 1967.

OLD/1986/0974 - Erection of 17 lock up garages REFUSED 28/07/86

OLD/2000/0604 - Residential development to provide 7 x 2 storey houses and 1 self-contained flat with car ports / parking for 14 cars, also 26 lockup garages REFUSED 15/12/00 subsequent appeal DISMISSED

OLD/2000/0605 - Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of garages REFUSED 15/12/00

HGY/2000/0935 - Application to erect 7 houses and one flat and garages in basement area REFUSED 05/12/00 subsequent appeal DISMISSED

HGY/2000/0933 - Conservation Area Consent to erect 7 houses and one flat and garages in basement area REFUSED 05/12/00 subsequent appeal DISMISSED.

HGY/2001/1696 - Application to erect 6 dwellings and ten garages REFUSED 06/04/04 subsequent appeal DISMISSED.

HGY/2001/1697- Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of garages REFUSED 27/07/04 subsequent appeal DISMISSED.

HGY/2005/1985 - Demolition of existing 35 garages and erection of 5 x 2 storey three bedroom houses with associated landscaping and 10 No parking spaces.

WITHDRAWN 14/12/05

HGY/2005/1987 - Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of 35 garages. WITHDRAWN 14/12/05

HGY/2006/0580 - Demolition of existing 39 garages and erection of 5 x 2 storey three bedroom houses with associated landscaping and 10 no. parking spaces REFUSED subsequent appeal DISMISSED

HGY/2008/1020 - Demolition of existing 39 garages and erection of 5 x 2 storey three bedroom houses with associated landscaping and 10 no. parking spaces REFUSED subsequent appeal DISMISSED

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The application proposes the demolition of 32 existing lock-up garages situated on the site and erection of 4 x 2/3 storey three bedroom houses with associated landscaping and the formation of 8 no. parking spaces. 3 units would contain a ground floor level with combined kitchen and dining room with a first floor level of three bedrooms one with ensuite. The one other unit referred too as unit 2 would contain the same layout at the first floor level but with the living room at lower ground level.

CONSULTATION

Transportation
Cleaving
Building Control
Ward Councillors
Hornsey CAAC
Conservation Team
Council Arboriculturalist
63a, 1 – 63 (o) Cecile Park, N8
30 – 52 (e) Cecile Park, N8
17a, 29a, 29b Cecile Park, N8
2 – 46 (e) Tregaron Ave, N8
7 – 29 (o) Elm Grove, N8

RESPONSES

Conservation Officer

This site has had a succession of 3 planning applications and 3 planning appeals for residential development on this backland site. In response to the Refusals the applicants have reduced the number of houses from 7 to 6 to 5.

In this application the number has been reduced further to 4 detached houses.

In para. 21 of the most recent Planning Appeal, Ref APP/Y5420/A/09/2093786 & /2093789, the Inspector's affirmed the principle of residential development on this backland site; 'the appeal would now involve only a small number of buildings, of relatively low height, and its visual impact would be slight. Consequently I do not consider that harm would be caused to the area's development pattern.'

The Planning Inspector had concerns regarding the siting of the house on Plot 5 and considered that its effect on trees would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The current application deletes the previously proposed house on Plot 5, which addresses the basis of the previous reason for refusal for the scheme, and accordingly there is no Design & Conservation objection to the current proposals.

Waste Management - raised no objections.

Transportation - Transportation has raised several objections to previous applications HGY/2008/1020 and HGY/2008/1021 on the basis of the loss of available parking space due to the loss of the garages and the potential for an increase in on street parking in an area which has been defined as being within the "Crouch End Restricted Conversion Area" as having high on street parking demand.

These applications have been subject to the Planning Appeal Process and previous highway inspectors have dismissed the transportation and highways objections saying “The loss of the existing garages would cause no significant harm, nor would it conflict with any of the development policies identified in the inquiry”. And as such it would not be prudent to raise an objection to the development on the grounds of loss of parking or an increase in on street parking stress.

Hornsey CAAC –

The only difference between this application and the most recent one, HGY 2008/1020 and 1021, which was dismissed on appeal, is that there will be four houses instead of five, and eight parking spaces instead of ten. The design of the houses will be exactly the same, and our objections to this are as follows:

1. The pastiche design is of substandard quality and out of character with the style of nearby houses, eg. the mansard roofs.
2. There would be insufficient south sunlight in the north/south facing houses.
3. The site is too narrow to accommodate houses without undermining the back-to-back and front-to-front character of existing terraced housing.
4. The loss of thirty-nine lock-up garages and several on-street parking spaces in an area of existing night-time on-street parking pressure.

To the **initial** consultation, a **petition** with 106 signatures and other letters of objection was received. The objections that have been raised can be summarised as follows:-

- Would disrupt the visual outlook between Cecile park and Tregaron Avenue
- Noise levels would increase as well as vulnerability to crime
- Concern regarding loss of property values
- Site is a backlands property and there is already too much development on sites such as this
- Would have an adverse impact on the conservation area
- Would result in loss of privacy and overlooking
- Loss of valuable open space
- Narrow entrance to site will create difficulties for refuse collection & emergency vehicles
- Amounts to overdevelopment of the site
- Overlooking from first floor side window of No. 11 Elm Grove
- Would result in loss of light to surrounding properties including gardens
- Lack of landscaping details
- Concern that the front elevation of the dwellings does not accurately reflect the relationship with the houses located to the rear. Is it proposed to reduce the level of the site to achieve the low height of the houses? And if so what effect will the lowering of the houses have on the trees?

- Development would have a significant impact on adjoining properties fronting Tregaron Ave. These Tregaron Ave properties have shorter gardens.
- Further housing in an area already densely populated with many existing problems.
- Concern at proximity of the proposed houses to existing neighbouring housing.
- Impact on trees.
- Loss of existing garages / parking on the site would exacerbate existing parking issues in the area

Building Control - 'The proposals have been checked under Regulation B5 – access for the fire service, and we have no observations to make'.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

National Policy

PPS1 'Sustainable Development'
 PPS3 'Housing'
 PPG15 'Planning and the history environmental'

Unitary Development Plan

UD 3 'General Principles'
 UD 4 'Quality Design'
 CSV 1 'Development in Conservation Areas'
 CSV 7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas'
 HSG 1 'New Housing Developments'
 HSG 2 'Change of Use to Residential'
 HSG 9 'Density Standards'
 M3 'New Development Location and Accessibility'
 M10 'Parking for Development'

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPD 'Housing' - 'Density, Dwelling Mix, Floorspace Minima, Conversions, Extensions and Lifetime Homes'
 SPG 1a 'Design Guidance and Design Statements'
 SPG 3b 'Privacy / Overlooking / Aspect / Outlook and daylight / Sunlight'
 SPG 3c 'Backlands Development'

ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION

The site and proposal is as described above. In a recent appeal against the Council's refusal of a proposal for the demolition of the garages, an Inspector granted Conservation Area Consent unconditionally for the demolition of the existing garages.

'paragraph 38 I appreciate that PPG15 advises that consent for demolition should not be given unless there are acceptable plans for the redevelopment, and I note the Council's concern to avoid dereliction. But in this case, it seems to me that these considerations are outweighed by the continuing visual harm caused by the garages' retention. In the circumstances, I conclude that their demolition would cause no harm, and thus would not conflict with Policy CSV7'.

Conservation Area Consent is therefore recommended to be given unconditionally.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Conservation Area Consent is therefore recommended to be given unconditionally.

RECOMMENDATION

GRANT PERMISSION

Registered No. HGY/2009/1769

Applicant's drawing No. (s) PL01 - PL05 incl.