

## **REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Reference No:** HGY/2007/0920

**Ward:** Crouch End

**Date received:** 02/05/2007

**Last amended date:** N/A

**Drawing number of plans:** 2(01)00, 2(02)00, 2(03)00, 2(04)00, 2(05)00, 01, 02, 03; 2(12)00, 01, 02, 03, -01; 2(13)00, 2(14)00, 01, 02, 03

**Address:** Former Mountview Theatre School, 104 Crouch Hill N8

**Proposal:** Demolition of existing buildings and erection of 4 x three bedroom dwelling houses.

**Existing Use:** Theatre School

**Proposed Use:** Residential

**Applicant:** City & Suburban Homes Ltd

**Ownership:** Private

### **PLANNING DESIGNATIONS**

Retrieved from GIS on 14/05/2007

Tree Preservation Order

Conservation Area

Road Network: Classified Road

**Officer Contact:** Oliver Christian

### **RECOMMENDATION**

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions

### **SITE AND SURROUNDINGS**

The site, part of the former rear garden of 104 Crouch Hill – There are currently extension buildings on the site at the rear of 104 Crouch Hill with a frontage onto Cecile Park.

The land slope down toward Cecile Park. - The rear of the site back onto the communal garden of a residential block of flats.

The site is within the Crouch End Conservation Area. The adjoining site contains a number of mature trees some that are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders (TPO's).

## **PLANNING HISTORY**

2000/0201                      GTD    01-07-00    104 Crouch Hill  
Erection of pre fabricated building to provide toilets, washing facilities and changing room.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

The current proposal seeks the demolition of rear extension of existing theatre school buildings and erection of 4 x three bedroom dwelling houses.

## **CONSULTATION**

Local Residents – 1 -11 (o) flats 1 -7, 2, 4, 6 -18 Cecile Park, 1 – 12 Ivor Court  
Crouch Hill, 106 – 116 Crouch Hill, 115 – 137 Crouch Hill  
Transportation Group  
Arboriculturist  
Conservation/ Design Officer  
Building Control  
Hornsey CAAC  
Waste Management  
Conservation Advert 25/05/2007  
Ward Councillors

## **RESPONSES**

An objection has been received from (Cecile Park Residents Ltd) and is summarised as follows:  
Increased parking pressure, over intensity of use of site, reduction in green areas, loss of cultural, arts and education use.

**Transportation Group** – There is the concern that this site falls within Crouch End Restricted Conversion Area (Adopted 2006 UDP Policy HSG 11), in view of the existing on-street parking pressure at this location. Hence, the creation of additional residential units without off-street car parking provisions would exacerbate this parking pressure. The Council's adopted UDP 2006 Policy HSG11 lists this section of Crouch Hill as one of the areas where "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". We will subsequently apply Policy I.3 of Appendix 1 UDP 2006 which requires that the applicant provides 6 car parking spaces (1.5 spaces per unit) for a development of this magnitude.

Consequently, in view of the lack of car parking provision by the applicant, in an area with severe parking pressure, compounded by the unavailability of adequate parking control mechanisms in this location with low public transport accessibility level, the highway and transportation authority object to this

application

**Hornsey CAAC** - Does not object to the proposal in principle but requested some alteration to the proposal – these have been addressed in the revised proposal.

**Arboriculturist** – No objection to the proposal.

**Conservation/Design Officer** – Comments as follows: Overall, the principle of terraced residential development of high design quality at this site is welcome. However, the following are points of concern.

**Relationship with street** – The first floor window of these houses opens into a double height space over the kitchen. This means that there is no scope for active uses overlooking the street. The kitchen itself does not have any direct relationship with the street. Ideally we should encourage design that provides active uses that look out onto the street thereby increasing passive surveillance and security. It is also not clear how the first floor windows provide ventilation to the kitchen.

**Depth of building** – The group of buildings proposed is very deep in section at around 15 metres. The pattern of development locally is of typical building depths of 9.5 – 10metres. Typically accommodation that extends to the rear drops down in height to prevent overshadowing. In addition to concerns about overshadowing, the combination of increased depth in section plus the apparent increase in height presented by the flat roof results in a fairly bulky development.

**Materials** – I would encourage the designer to provide a more consistent approach in terms of material qualities. I am not convinced by the design strategy of employing a variety of brick types to define each house. Given that other local examples of terraced groupings tend to employ the same materials within the group and use vertical and projecting features to differentiate between dwellings I would recommend considering a similar approach.

**Rainwater goods** – There is no indication given on the drawings of how rainwater is handled; these minor elements could help provide vertical definition and should be employed with care.

Cllr Winskill objects to the proposal on the safety grounds, over development – loss of feeling of openness and therefore loss of amenity for local residents.

**RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY**  
**National Policy Background**  
**Planning Policy Statement- 3 Housing**

The principal national policy guidance relating to residential development is contained in Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing. This PPG provides guidance on a range of issues relating to the provision of housing. Circular 6/98 *Planning and Affordable Housing* will continue to apply, within the framework of policy set out in this guidance.

PPS3 states that Local Planning authorities should:

- Provide sufficient housing land but give priority to re-using previously-developed land within urban areas, bringing empty homes back into use and converting existing buildings, in preference to the development of greenfield sites;
- Promote improved quality of developments which in their design, layout and allocation of space create a sense of community; and
- Introduce greater flexibility in the application of parking standards, which the government expects to be significantly lower than at present.

**Planning Policy Statement 13 Transport**

Planning Policy Statement 13 Transport aims to:

- Promote more sustainable transport choices for people and for moving freight.
- Promote accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling.
- Reduce the need to travel especially by car.

**The London Plan**

The London Plan adopted in February 2004 by the Greater London Authority forms the Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London. It contains key policies covering housing, transport, design and sustainability in the capital. It replaces Regional Planning Guidance Note 3 - Regional Planning Guidance for London.

The London Plan also sets out density targets for residential development in London. Various ranges are specified. Of particular relevance to this site - urban sites close to transport corridors with a low accessibility index proposed for flatted development may have a range of 300-450 hrh.

**Local Policy Background**

G2 Development and Urban Design  
G3 Housing Supply  
G10 Conservation  
UD3 General Principles

UD4 Quality Design  
HSG9 Density Standards  
ENV9 Energy Efficiency  
ENV10 Renewable Energy  
CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas  
CSV5 Alterations and Extensions in Conservation Areas  
CSV7 Demolition in Conservation Areas  
OS17 Tree Protection, Tree Masses and Spines  
M10 Parking for Development

### **Supplementary Planning Guidance**

SPG 1a Design Guidance  
SPG3a Density et al  
SPG3b Privacy/outlook

### **ANALYSIS / ASSESSMENT OF THE APPLICATION**

The main issues here are considered to be:-

1. Principle of residential development
2. Density
3. Layout
4. Design
5. Parking, Re-cycling
6. Sustainability
7. Impact on privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents
8. Objector's comments

#### **Principle of residential development**

PPS3 and the London Plan encourage residential development of previously used sites.

The pressure for housing in London means that site such as these are increasingly considered for housing development.

The site is currently covered by dilapidated out buildings of no architectural or conservation merit.

The redevelopment/reuse of the site for residential dwellings is in line with advice In PPS3, The London Plan and UDP Policy G3 'Housing Supply'.

#### **Density**

There is no in principle presumption against development of this sites either in UDP Policy HSG9 or in SPG 3C providing certain criteria are met.

In this case there would be 24 habitable rooms on a site area of approximately 0.0758 hectares. This would give a density of 317 habitable rooms per hectare.

The SPG3c attached to Policy HSG 9 of the Unitary Development Plan, states that the Council densities should normally be within the range 200 – 700 hrh. The density on the site is within the range recommended in the Unitary Development Plan and is not in itself considered to be a sufficient reason to withhold planning permission.

### **Design and Layout**

The overall height of the development is 3 storeys with a basement area that utilises the natural slope of the land.

The individual dwelling houses are approximately 5.1m in width and 14.5m in depth; the development follows the existing front building line and is well away from the boundary which backs onto the communal rear gardens of residential block on Crouch Hill.

The proposal, due to its set back from the boundary, retains a gap between the proposed development and the existing property on the adjoining site. The proposed development does not result in the loss of open space in that it replaces existing buildings covering most of the site and does not have an adverse impact upon important trees on the neighbouring site, as such is not contrary to policies

The materials proposed are traditional brick and slate common to the locality. The proposal is therefore not in conflict with Policy UD4 Design Guidance, or Policy CSV1 Development in Conservation Areas which seeks the utilisation of material that are common to the locality and that will preserve and enhance the conservation area.

External amenity space has been provided for the dwelling houses meeting the requirement for family units of 50sqm, on balance, the proposal is in keeping with the overall provisions of SPG 3a.

The layout is considered acceptable in that the room sizes meet the required space standard as set out in the Council's supplementary guidance. There is adequate ventilation to all rooms.

### **Parking / Recycling**

Transportation is not satisfied with the proposal in that no off-street car parking is proposed. Stating, the proposal would not be in keeping with the provisions of Policy M10.

It is considered that the proposed development result in a lower level of car parking need than the lawful use as a Theatre.

As such it is considered that a small scheme such as this would not lead to severe on street car parking pressure.

Additionally off street car parking in front gardens is not encouraged within conservation area in that it leads to a loss of green space/garden area. If off street car parking was introduced to each property, it is considered that it would lead to a loss of front garden area and have an adverse visual impact on the conservation area

Easily accessible refuse and recycling facility is proposed for each of the dwellings.

### **Sustainability**

The reuse of under utilised land and reclaimed materials are important features of the development that comply with the thrust of National and London wide guidance.

In addition the scheme provides for good natural ventilation and day lighting. In terms of assessment of this type of development, the BRE Echomes Assessment procedure is regarded as most appropriate.

This approach is used to benchmark the overall sustainability of developments. Using this approach based on an assessment of seven key areas: (including energy, transport, pollution, materials, health/wellbeing, water/land use and ecology).

The scheme incorporates features for recycling and separation of household waste, sustainable building material and suppliers, energy efficiency and increased green space.

### **Impact on the living conditions of adjoining properties**

Policy UD3 recognises the sensitive nature of Conservation Areas and the importance of safeguarding architectural integrity also visual and residential amenity.

This proposal introduces gable fronts and flat roof elements. These elements would be provided on each of the four houses – in keeping with the design principles of the adjoining properties. It is considered the proposals would not have an unacceptable relationship on the streetscape.

The rear gardens of the adjoining properties vary in depth. Taking into account the level change between Crouch Hill and Cecile Park also the distance from the rear of the dwellings to the existing block of flats; the relationship is again considered to be acceptable regarding issues of loss of light overshadowing, outlook and visual intrusion.

It is accepted that visual outlook would be altered by the introduction of these properties, however taking into account their overall massing and positioning;

it is considered that the outlook proposed would not be harmful. In this respect the proposal would comply with criteria in policies UD3 and HSG9 and SPG3c

In relation to privacy and overlooking the proposals have been designed with no windows in the side elevations of the new houses at upper levels. The windows that face toward to the rear gardens of adjoining properties are at reasonable distances.

Some oblique overlooking maybe possible from the upper windows, taking into account that this minimal overlooking would be of rear gardens and from bedrooms this is not considered sufficient in itself to cause severe harm. In this respect the proposal would comply with criteria in policies UD3 and HSG9 and SPG3c.

It must be recognised that oblique overlooking of gardens is already widespread from upper floor rear windows of old established terraced houses in the area; first and second floor back bedrooms will overlook the gardens of next door neighbours.

### **Objector's comments**

The main issues raised the primary objector (Cecile Park Residents Ltd) who manage the adjacent block of flats are the impact of the development of the site on the amenity of the existing residents. Consultation response has raised a number of issues of which the following are the main issues of concern.

They are concerned that the proposal would be an overdevelopment of the site resulting in the loss of the open nature of the rear garden also resulting in a loss of view by neighbouring residents.

Concerns were expressed that the resultant residential development would result in a loss of privacy and amenity for neighbouring residents.

It was expressed that the proposal would result in a loss of visual amenity as a result of the introduction of the inappropriate residential development that will look out of place.

It is recognised that any new development, especially within a conservation area is likely to have some impact on amenity of the existing residents. It is considered that this development has no detrimental impact on the amenity currently being enjoyed; additionally the proposal has proposed a design and scale of development that is appropriate for the location.

Objection also raised on traffic generation and lack of off street parking by (Cecile Park Residents Ltd).

The site is located in the Crouch End Conservation Area but not within the designated controlled parking zone – within the locality off-street car parking in front gardens is not an option both in terms of the visual harm and also that many front gardens are too shallow to allow parking. Off street car parking in



front gardens is not encouraged within conservation area in that it leads to a loss of green space/garden area and introduces unsightly dropped kerbs/crossover. Additionally the lawful use is a more intensive use than the proposal in terms of traffic generation.

There is also the contradictory situation in that by providing crossovers they lead to loss of on-street car parking spaces.

The houses do not cover the whole site due to the introduction of rear gardens and retaining a reasonable degree of space between the existing buildings and the proposed development.

It is considered that the proposal would introduce houses of an appropriate design and scale with the surrounding properties.

The conservation officer considers that improved detailing and consistency of material would improve the scheme and would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area – the revised proposal has addressed these comments.

## **SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The proposed three-storey development, which fronts onto Cecile Park, proposes a design that is within keeping with this location and the Conservation Area.

It is considered that the proposal meets the aims and the provisions of Policies UD3, UD4, CSV1, and CSV7 also Policy ENV9. It is therefore an appropriate development without detrimental amenity impact and approval is recommended.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **GRANT PERMISSION**

Registered No. HGY/2007/0920

Applicant's drawing No(s): 2(01)00, 2(02)00, 2(03)00, 2(04)00, 2(05)00, 01, 02, 03; 2(12)00, 01, 02, 03, -01; 2(13)00, 2(14)00, 01, 02, 03

Subject to the following condition(s)

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 complete accordance with the plans and specifications submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.  
Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.
3. Samples of all materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority before any development is commenced. Samples should include sample panels or brick types and a roofing material sample combined with a schedule of the exact product references.  
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.
4. The construction works of the development hereby granted shall not be carried out before 0800 or after 1800 hours Monday to Friday or before 0800 or after 1200 hours on Saturday and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.  
Reason: In order to ensure that the proposal does not prejudice the enjoyment of neighbouring occupiers of their properties.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 1 of the Town & Country Planning General Permitted Development Order 1995, no enlargement, improvement or other alteration of any of the dwellings hereby approved in the form of development falling within Classes A to H shall be carried out without the submission of a particular planning application to the Local Planning Authority for its determination.  
Reason: To avoid overdevelopment of the site.
6. No development shall take place until site investigation detailing previous and existing land uses, potential land contamination, risk estimation and remediation work if required have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.  
Reason: In order for the Local Planning Authority to ensure the site is contamination free.
7. Details of the method of recycling and separation of household waste, sustainable building material and suppliers, energy efficiency shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and these works shall be carried out as approved.  
Reason: To meet the Council's sustainability best practice procedures.

INFORMATIVE: The new development will require naming / numbering. The applicant should contact the Transportation Group at least six weeks before the development is occupied (tel. 020 8489 5573) to arrange for the allocation of a suitable address.

INFORMATIVE: The applicant is advised that in the interests of the security of the development hereby authorised that all works should comply with BS 8220 (1986), Part 1 - 'Security Of Residential Buildings'.

INFORMATIVE: Details of the foundation work on the boundaries and any border treatment should be agreed with the adjoining occupiers before such works commence.

#### REASONS FOR APPROVAL

The development, which fronts onto Cecile Park, proposes a design that is within keeping with this location and the Conservation Area meeting the aims and the provisions of Policies UD3 'General Principles', UD4 'Quality Design', CSV1 'Development in Conservation Areas', CSV7 'Demolition in Conservation Areas' and Policy M10 'Parking for Development' of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan.