

ADDENDUM REPORT

Reference No: HGY/2014/1041 and HGY/2014/1042	Ward: Bruce Grove
Address: 5 Bruce Gove, London, N8 9BT	
Proposal: Demolition of side and rear extensions. Conversion of part ground, first and second floors into four flats (3 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed). Erection of 10 Houses (8 x 3 bed and 2 x 4 bed) at the rear of the site with associated access road, parking spaces and landscaping.	
Applicant: Islington Property Limited	

1. Background

1.1 At the meeting of the Planning Sub-Committee on 15 September 2014, the Chair put forward a motion to defer the above applications. The motion was passed and the subsequent reasons for deferral were:

- Due to uncertainty on the submission of a representation from Transport for London (TfL) and concerns over traffic access in a busy red route area and as such whether the development should be car free.
- Clarification should also be sought as to whether English Heritage would reassess the application.
- It was also requested that a second site visit be held before the rehearing and that if possible the applicant try to clear debris from the site to allow Members to see the building more clearly.

2. Parking and highway safety matters

2.1 Subsequent to the committee meeting on 15 September 2014 the Council's Transport Planner has provided an updated assessment which is attached at Appendix 1 to this addendum report and the most relevant sections replicated as below. Following the updated assessment the recommendation to approve the development from a parking and highway safety point of view remains unchanged.

2.2 A site visit was conducted on 1 October 2014 during the evening peak period between 5pm and 6:15pm. During the site visit it was observed that there were heavy pedestrian flows and queuing at the bus stop. However the queues were not observed to be impacting on the footway which directly abuts the site. It is to be noted that the frequency of the buses on this section of footways is some 23 buses per hour with a bus every 5-7 minutes. During the time of the site visit the maximum number of passengers that was observed to be queuing was 37 passengers in the northwest direction (site side), 28 of which boarded the 243 bus and the remainder on the W4 bus. No queues in excess of 10 passengers were observed on the southeast bound direction and at no time were queues observed to be reaching 6 Bruce Grove. It is therefore unlikely that any queuing resulting from the demand at the Northwest or Southeast bus stops will impact on the existing access arrangements.

2.3 Transport for London is the Highways Authority for Bruce Grove and (in summary) comments that the proposed access arrangements could work better than the current arrangements. The one parking space for the Conservative Club is not a major concern to TfL as long as the vehicle can turn around in the site which seems practicable for cars. As both access points operated together then vehicles larger than a car could enter and leave the site in forward gear and only reverse within the site. TfL are suggesting car free is feasible. In summary, TfL does not object to Haringey Council approving the application subject to conditions.

3. Heritage matters

3.1 Subsequent to the committee meeting on 15 September 2014 the extension proposed to be demolished was revisited and reassessed by the Council's Principal Conservation Officer. The Principal Conservation Officer's updated assessment is attached at Appendix 2 to this addendum report. Following the further assessment the recommendation to approve the development from a conservation point of view remains unchanged.

3.2 As emphasised in the Barnwell Manor Case, the less than significant harm to the listed building (caused by the loss of the later extensions) has been given considerable weight. However, it is felt that the significant heritage benefit provided by the proposed scheme, would outweigh the less than significant harm to the listed building. It is also felt that the restoration of the original and most significant part of the building and its sustained future use would preserve the original character and appearance of the building, in line with the Council's statutory duty under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990. It is also felt that, by securing the long term use of the building, the public benefit of the scheme would outweigh the less than significant harm that would be caused by the removal of the extension as per NPPF Policy 134.

3.3 However, in addition to the conditions attached previously, a further condition to record the elements to be demolished at level 3 (as per English Heritage's guidance on Understanding Historic Buildings) should be attached to ensure that the structures, including their interiors are photographed and documented for future reference.

3.4 It is also felt that the photographs and frames at present installed within the Billiards Room are significant to the history of the Club. These should be carefully removed and reinstated within the premises of the Club. A condition ensuring the same should be attached accordingly.

3.5 At the previous committee local residents suggested that English Heritage had provided grant for internal repairs previously and had recently suggested that it would reassess the significance of the internal features. English Heritage has confirmed that it did not provide such a grant and that it has no plans to reassess the significance of the internal features.

4. Affordable housing

4.1 It was reported (paragraph 6.15.4) at the previous committee meeting on the 15 September 2014 that the applicant had submitted a financial viability assessment showing that the provision of affordable housing is not viable due to the costs of restoring the listed building and that this has been independently assessed and found valid. This conclusion remains unchanged.

5. Section 106 obligations and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

5.1 Since the planning application was last before the Planning Sub-committee, the Council has adopted the Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Haringey's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) has come into force. This means that a revised s106 agreement for the proposal is required whereby the education component drops away and is accounted for in the Council's CIL. The previous s106 contributions for cycle network improvement and car restricted development remain payable and therefore the revised s106 amounts are:

Cycle network improvement: - £20,000
Car restricted development: £1,000

5.2 In addition, subsequent to receipt of an amended CIL calculation form, the amount required for the Mayor's CIL payment has been updated and is now £52,430 instead of that originally indicated (£40,219) in the committee report presented to the Planning Sub-committee on 15 September.

Given the above, the required CIL amounts are:

Mayoral CIL: $1,498\text{m}^2 \times £35 = £52,430$
Haringey CIL: $1,498\text{m}^2 \times £15 = £22,470$

6. Recommendations

6.1 It is recommended that the Planning Sub-committee GRANT planning permission subject to a revised section 106 legal agreement and the conditions as set out in the committee report for the application (Council ref: HGY/2014/1041) tabled at the Planning Sub-committee meeting on 15 September 2014.

6.2 It is recommended that the Planning Sub-committee GRANT listed building consent subject to the conditions and informative as set out in the committee report for the application (Council ref: HGY/2014/1042) tabled at the Planning Sub-committee meeting on 15 September 2014 and the additional conditions as set out below:

1. No demolition of the existing structures shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of historic building recording and analysis (RCHME Level 3 minimum) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building consistent with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policies CSV4 and CVS6 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

2. The existing photograph frames within the extensions to be demolished should be carefully removed and reinstated within the Club's premises at suitable locations prior to demolition commencing.

Reason: Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building consistent with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2011, Policy SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Policies CSV4 and CVS6 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006.

APPENDIX 1

Transportation Officer's revised assessment INTERNAL POST

Transportation

Contact: Maurice Richards
Tel: 5575

To: Borough Planning
Attn: Tobias Finlayson
Ref: 20141041
Date: 06 June 2014

Site: 5 Bruce Grove, NI7 6RA

Proposal Demolition of side and rear extensions. Conversion of part ground, first and second floors into four flats (3 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed). Erection of 10 Houses (8 x 3 bed and 2 x 4 bed) at the rear of the site with associated access road, parking spaces and landscaping.

5 Bruce Grove Revised Comments.

The proposed site is located on Bruce Grove which is part of the Transport for London Road network (TLRN), Bruce Grove forms part of the A10 which connects the Tottenham with Enfield and Stamford Hill. This section of the A10 is heavily trafficked and suffers from a degree of congestion in the morning and evening peak periods due to the volume of traffic and traffic signals at the junction of the A1010 Tottenham High Road. The application site has a high public transport accessibility level with a PTAL of 6 and is situated within the immediate vicinity of Bruce Grove rail station. The site is also served by a number of bus routes, available on Bruce Grove and High Road Tottenham, which run with a combined two-way frequency of 157 buses per hour.

The entrance to the site is some 69 metre from the junction of Bruce Grove with the A1010. There are several bus routes which runs via Bruce Grove [123,243 and W4], there is a southeast bound bus stop directly fronting the site and bus stop site sidesome 44 metres northwest of the site immediately fronting number 7 Bruce Grove. The footway by the site is between 2.0 to 2.3 metres in width and has high pedestrian flows during the morning and evening peak periods. The site has two existing crossovers which are to be retained and used. Both crossovers are more than 4.1 metres in width and can facilitate two way traffic movement. It is to be noted that this section of Bruce Grove has a number of crossover which service the properties between 1 Bruce Grove to the junction of Bruce Grove with Woodside Avenue. Bruce Grove has parking restrictions in the form of single red lines (no stopping between 7am and 7pm except between 10am and 7pm when parking is permitted for 20 minutes); the Borough Roads to the west of the High Road A1010 and A10 do not form part of a controlled parking zone.

A site visit was conducted on the 01/10/2014 during the evening peak period between 5pm and 6:15pm. During the site visit it was observed that there were heavy pedestrian flows and queuing at the bus stop. However the queues were not observed to be impacting on the footway which directly abuts the site. It is to be noted that the frequency of the buses on this section of footways is some 23 buses per hour with a bus every 5-7 minutes. During the time of the site visit the maximum number of passengers that was observed to be queuing was 37 passengers in the northwest direction (siteside), 28 of which boarded the 243 bus, and the remainder on the W4 bus. No queue in excess of 10 passengers was observed on the southeast bound direction; at no time were queues observed to be reaching no. 6 Bruce Grove. It is therefore unlikely that any queuing resulting from the demand at the Northwest or Southeast bus stops will impact on the existing access arrangements.

The applicant is proposing to develop the site to provide 14 unit development consists of 10 new build family sized houses as well as 4 flats within the existing building. The development will include 10 off street car parking spaces including 1 disabled car parking space and 24 sheltered secure cycle parking spaces. We have assessed the maximum number of trips that could be generated by the proposed development based on similar sites from the TRICS Trip: Discovery Docks, E14, Putney Wharf SW15 and St Georges Wharf SW18. 10 units would generate some 2 in/out vehicular trips during the critical am

peak hour. In addition if we were to assume a worst case scenario of 10 in out trips during the morning peak in this location, this would not be dissimilar to the trips from the existing access at Champam Close [between 6 and 7 Bruce Grove] or 6 Bruce Grove which has 8 car parking spaces. We do not consider the trips that will be generated by the proposed development will impact on pedestrian safety and amenity or traffic flow at this location.

The proposed houses will be served by a shared surface access road which will measure 4.1 metres in width and will be surfaced in Tegula setts to highlight the shared nature of the road. The width of the proposed access exceeds the minimum of 3.7 metres required for access by fire appliances. The drawings also indicate a refuse storage area within 25 metres of the public highway. It is intended that the existing kerbside refuse arrangements remain in place.

The site falls within the Bruce Grove Restricted Conversion area, which has a requirement for a higher level of off-street parking provision. However the disabled access unit as well as all of the family sized units will be served by their own designated parking space as indicated on the proposed ground floor plan drawing no. 154-PL20P00. 20% of the parking spaces will be equipped with electric charging points, with an additional 20% passive provision in line with standards set out within the London Plan. Although the smaller sized flats will not be served by designated on-site parking provision it is considered that the very high level of public transport accessibility and the lack of on-street parking opportunities within the immediate vicinity of the site will severely limit car ownership for the prospective residents of this part of the development. We will also require that the applicant enter into a S106 agreement to secure the developments designation as "Car-restricted". This will prevent prospective residents from applying for on-street parking permits should new controlled on-street parking restrictions be put in place in the future.

The cycle parking has been provided in line with London Plan standards with the applicant providing 24 secure sheltered cycle parking spaces. We will require the applicant to make a financial contribution towards implementing and improving cycling infrastructure to encourage cycling. We will therefore require the applicant to make a financial contribution towards the upgrading and improving the cycle connectivity of local cycle routes to the wider cycle network.

Transport for London is the Highways Authority for Bruce Grove and has made comments on the application which are summarised as follows:

The proposed access arrangements could work better than the current arrangements. The one parking space for the Conservative Club is not a major concern to TfL as long as the vehicle can turn around in the site which seems practicable for cars. As both access points operated together then vehicles larger than a car could enter and leave the site in forward gear and only reverse within the site.

TfL suggests car free is feasible.

TfL doesn't want large vehicles reversing on Bruce Grove. Vehicles should only stop on Bruce Grove where existing controls allow.

TfL would support fewer shared refuse bins which would be better than individual bins for each house but recognise this is an issue for the Council.

We welcome the request for the DSP and CLP. On the CLP, it is suggested that they consult TfL before they submit to the Council and would probably need a site meeting with their contractor i.e. the CLP has best value if it developed by the builder or potential builder rather than left purely in the hands of the transport consultant/ architect.

Even with electronic control, there will be occasions when visitors/ residents will block the footway – whilst they wait for the gate to open. Given the scale of the development – this will occur occasionally. A small cul-de-sac of houses should not be gated and generally should be open but TfL recognise this is for the Council to decide.

In summary TfL does not object to Haringey Council approving the application, subject to conditions related to CLP and DSP including information on refuse collection plan and generally how they will manage larger vehicles wishing to deliver to site. For TfL, electronic control gates are acceptable, it would also deter larger vehicles entering the site and having to reverse onto Bruce Grove.

The highway and transportation authority agree with the findings of Transport for London and the Transport Statement and consider that the development will not have any significant negative impact on the surrounding highway network. The applicant is

proposing to use the existing access; we have therefore considered that providing that subject to the imposition of the following S106 obligations and conditions as requested by Transport for London and the Transportation Planning Team there are no Highways and Transportation objection to this application.

S.106 Obligations:

1. The Applicant/ Developer will be required to contribute by way of a S.106 agreement £20,000 (twenty thousand pounds) for improvements to the wider London cycle network within the vicinity of the site.

Reason: To facilitate travel by sustainable modes to and from the site.

2. The applicant shall enter into a S106 agreement requiring that the residential units are defined as car-restricted and therefore no residents therein will be entitled to apply for a residents parking permit under the terms of the relevant Traffic Management Order (TMO) Controlling on street parking in the vicinity of the development. The applicant must contribute a sum of £1000 (one thousand pounds) towards the amendment of the TMO for this purpose.

Reason: To encourage the prospective residents of this development to use sustainable travel modes.

3. A Travel Plan Statement must be secured by a S.106 agreement. As part of the travel plan statement, the following measures must be included in order to maximise the use of sustainable transport:

a) The applicant/developer must offer all new residents of the proposed development two years free membership to a local Car Club and £50 credit to all new residents.

b) Provision of welcome induction packs containing public transport and cycling/walking information like available bus/rail/underground services, map and time-tables to all new residents.

Pre-commencement condition:

1. The Applicant/ Developer is required to submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) for the local authority's approval prior to construction work commencing on site. The Plans should provide details on how construction work (including demolition) would be undertaken in a manner that disruption to traffic and pedestrians on Bruce Grove and High Road Tottenham is minimised.

Additionally, the plans will need to ensure that all construction related activity can be restricted to within the site boundary without stopping or encroaching on Bruce Grove or creating a need for vehicles to reverse into or off site. It is also requested that construction vehicle movements should be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods.

Reason: To reduce congestion and mitigate any obstruction to the flow of traffic on the transportation network.

2. The applicant/operator is required to submit a Service and Delivery Plan (SDP) for the local authority's approval prior to occupancy of the proposed development. The Plans should provide details on how servicing including refuse collection and deliveries will take place. It is also requested that servicing and deliveries should be carefully planned and co-ordinated to avoid the AM and PM peak periods, the plan must be approved by TfL before the development is occupied.

3. The applicant must submit details of the proposed electronic gate.

Reason to ensure that the proposed gate will not have any impact on the TLRN

Reason: To reduce traffic and congestion on the transportation and highways network.

Informative:

The new development will require numbering. The applicant should contact the Local Land Charges at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

The applicant/developer is advised to liaise directly with Transport for London to clarify the scope of the Delivery service/Construction Management/Construction Logistics plans prior to their submission to the Local Planning Authority.

APPENDIX 2

Principal Conservation Officer's revised assessment

CONSERVATION COMMENTS

Application Ref: HGY/2014/1042 and 1041 (addendum to committee report)

Location: 5 Bruce Grove

Proposal: Listed Building Consent and planning permission for demolition of side and rear extensions. Conversion of part ground, first and second floors into four flats (3 x 1 bed and 1 x 2 bed). Erection of 10 Houses (8 x 3 bed and 2 x 4 bed) at the rear of the site with associated access road, parking spaces and landscaping.

Following the committee meeting on 15th September, the extension proposed to be demolished was revisited and reassessed.

Assessment of 5 Bruce Grove: Bruce Grove was developed as an affluent residential street off Tottenham High Road in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. A uniform terrace of semi-detached villas was developed during this period and inhabited by rich Quaker families. These are undoubtedly the earliest surviving buildings of Bruce Grove and no 5 forms part of this terrace.

The original house, built between 1785-90, is a three storey building with basement, in yellow stock brick. Architectural details include stuccoed cornices with paired quasi-modillions and blocking course. Fenestration is recessed sash windows with glazing bars and gauged flat brick arches and 6 panel doors. Original fanlight to the entrance, now lost.

When constructed, the building appears to have had a cart entrance to the side. This was later infilled between 1867 and 1896. Later rear additions were constructed and extended between 1896 and 1936. The last extension to the house was constructed in 1966 to the north-west rear corner. These were all ancillary extensions to facilitate the original building. The Conservative Club has been on site since at least 1936.

Within the conservation area, the building forms part of a group of similar contemporary buildings, positively contributing to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The building was listed in 1974 along with 6 Bruce Grove. The description bears no mention of any later additions and extensions and states:

List entry Number: 1358842

Location

5 AND 6, BRUCE GROVE N17

List entry Description

Details

1. 4415 BRUCE GROVE N17 (South West Side) Tottenham ----- TQ 3390
17/22 No 5 and No 6 7.2.74.

II GV

2. Late C18 or early C19 pair, each 3 storeys, and basement, 3 windows in main block. No 5 has 3 storey, 1 window set back left extension; No 6 has a 2 storey, 1 window flush right extension with a projecting late C19 bay. Stock brick. Stuccoed cornice with paired quasi-modillions and blocking course. Gauged flat brick arches to recessed sash windows with glazing bars, hose in the left bay of No 5 tripartite. 6 panel doors (that of No 6 with patterned fanlight) up 3 steps with wrought iron hand-rails. Wrought iron area railings.

Nos 1 to 16 (consec) form a group.

Assessment of later extension: The Billiards Room, built to the rear of the side extension built originally between 1867 and 1896 was constructed between 1915-1918. The interior decor is of Art Deco style, with sharp plaster details, typical of its period. Art Deco style function rooms originally had heavily panelled and decorated ceilings and walls, carefully patterned in various geometric shapes. However the interior of the Billiard Room is modest as the room was designed to be ancillary to the main building. There are photo frames within the walls that appear to have been recently painted, but these can be reinstated within the Club's premises.





Overall, it is felt that the significance of the later 1915 addition is relatively low compared to the original house.

At present, the condition of the main house is considered to be poor with damp issues and deteriorating internal fabric. The restoration of the original building is of paramount importance. It is accepted that the demolition of the later addition would lead to loss of evidential value of the heritage and would cause some harm to the significance of the listed building. However, this would also reinstate the original elevation of the house and facilitate its much required restoration and the conversion of the building to flats, ensuring its long term future use. This is a significant heritage benefit that ought to be balanced against the loss of the later addition.

As emphasised in the Barnwell Manor Case, the less than significant harm to the listed building (caused by the loss of the later extensions) has been given considerable weight. However, it is felt that the significant heritage benefit provided by the proposed scheme, would outweigh the less than significant harm to the listed building. It is also felt that the restoration of the original and most significant part of the building and its sustained future use would preserve the original character and appearance of the building, in line with the Council's statutory duty under Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990. It is also felt that, by securing the long term use of the building, the public benefit of the scheme would outweigh the less than significant harm that would be caused by the removal of the extension as per NPPF Policy 134.

Conclusion: Following the further assessment, the recommendation to approve the development from a conservation point of view remains same. However, in addition to the conditions attached previously, a further condition to record the elements to be demolished at level 3 (as per English Heritage's guidance on Understanding Historic Buildings) should be attached to ensure that the structures, including their interiors are photographed and documented for future reference.

It is also felt that the photographs and frames at present installed within the Billiards Room are significant to the history of the Club. These should be carefully removed and reinstated within the premises of the Club. A condition ensuring the same should be attached accordingly.

Further conditions to be attached:

'No demolition of the existing structures shall take place until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of historic building recording and analysis (RCHME Level 3 minimum), in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.'

'The existing photo frames within the extensions to be demolished should be carefully removed and reinstated within the Club's premises at suitable locations'.

Nairita Chakraborty

Principal Conservation Officer

2nd October 2014