

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2019/0984

Ward: Muswell Hill

Address: 76 Woodland Gardens N10 3UB

Proposal: Demolition of existing and construction of a new dwellinghouse.

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Evans

Ownership: Private

Case Officer Contact: Roland Sheldon

Date received: 02/04/2019 **Last amended date:** 26/04/2019

Drawing number of plans: A-00-001 rev. 11, A-03-114-01 rev. 12, A-03-114-02 rev. 12, A-03-114-03 rev. 12, A-03-112-02 rev. 11, A-03-112-01 rev. 11, A-03-112-03 rev. 11, A-03-132-01 rev. 12, A-03-132-03 rev. 12, A-03-132-02 rev. 12, A-03-132-05 rev. 12, A-03-132-04 rev. 12, A-03-133-01 rev. 12, A-03-133-02 rev. 12, A-03-133-03 rev. 12, A-03-133-04 rev. 12, A-03-133-05 rev. 12, A-03-133-06 rev. 12, A-03-133-07 rev. 12, A-03-133-08 rev. 12, Structural Engineering Report by AMA Consulting Engineers ref: AMA_REP_01 rev 01 Prepared Jul 2017

1.1 The application has generated significant public interest. A formal request by Councillor Ogiehor was made for the application to be determined by the Planning Sub-Committee, which was agreed by the Chair of the Planning Sub-Committee in discussion with the Head of Development Management.

1.2 SUMMARY OF KEY REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

The planning application follows a previous application for demolition of the existing and erection of a new dwelling that was subject to an appeal against non-determination, and subsequently dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate (LPA ref. HGY/2017/3650). Within the Inspectors' appeal decision, there were a number of points which outlined the reasons for the decision, which concluded the development would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area.

- Following amendments made to the design during the assessment of this application, Officers consider that the development adequately addresses concerns raised by the Inspector and would not result in demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area.
- The impact of the development on residential amenities is acceptable.
- Subject to compliance with recommended conditions, including a construction management plan, the development would not result in an unacceptable impact upon parking or highway safety conditions in the locality.

2. RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 That the Committee resolve to GRANT planning permission and that the Head of Development Management / Assistant Director for Planning 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 the permission is subject to the attachment of the conditions below:

Conditions (the full text of recommended conditions is contained at foot 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

Informatives

- 1) Land ownership
- 2) Hours of construction
- 3) Party Wall Act
- 4) CIL liable

5) Crossover

2.4 *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 with the roofspace. The proposed dwelling would have four bedrooms and a study located on the first and second floors and an open-plan living space at ground floor level. The basement floor would include a gym and playroom space alongside a workshop area.
- 3.2 The new dwelling would have a contemporary design that adopts a form and features that are characteristic of houses within the Woodland Gardens street scene; with a fair faced brick and timber frame window frontage. It would adjoin No 78 Woodland Gardens as per the current semi-detached dwelling on site.
- 3.3 The frontage would have a two-storey bay feature adjacent to the boundary with No 78 with a ground floor projecting bay window feature. A front projecting roof gable with glazed frontage also forms part of the frontage of the replacement house. The side (western) elevation would have a gable end with a large element of 'hit and miss' brickwork.

Site and Surroundings

- 3.4 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.
- 3.5 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.
- 3.6 As noted the street is predominantly characterised by terraced dwellings, built during the early 20th century. No 74 to the immediate west of the site is however detached and the application site and No 78 are semis.
- 3.7 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.

3.8 Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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. – dismissed at appeal.

“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”.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1.1 The following were consulted regarding the application, and a summary of responses is included below:

Internal

LBH Design: This substantially revised proposed new house has a design that is a close and faithful contemporary reinterpretation of the consistent existing houses of this street, especially its front, where all the main elements and many key details and materials will be replicated or reinterpreted in more contemporary, more minimalist but in appearance matching form, will enable it to sit comfortably in the street, whilst still being readable, when examined closely, as of this age.

LBH Transportation: Full details of cycle parking should be provided by condition. A Construction Logistics Plan would also be required for approval prior to the commencement of works on site.

LBH Building Control: The proposal is at higher risk given the property is semi detached and a 'type 3' basement is proposed. There is limited information regarding the soil conditions and adjacent trees. However, basic principles are noted and included in the working practices. The scheme would then be medium risk but well considered and there should be no objection to the BIA at this stage.

External

Thames Water Utilities: No objections received.

London Fire Brigade - Fire Safety Regulation: No objections received.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The following were consulted:

- Woodlands Conservation Area Action Group:
- A site notice was erected close to the site

5.2 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: 38

Objecting: 38

Supporting: -

Others: -

5.3 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Woodlands Conservation Area Action Group

The proposed design would diminish the quality and delight of the Edwardian area. A number of design alterations were raised as suggestions to improve the design quality of the scheme.

There is a lack of clarity regarding the western elevation glazing element

The development would be excessive in scale and over-dominant in the street scene and would have no architectural merit.

- Muswell Hill CAAC

The area is currently under consideration for inclusion within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. It is therefore important that the design does not detract from

the appearance of the street and would make a positive contribution to the appearance and character of the conservation area.

The north elevation was considered to be a crude pastiche lacking essential detailing and there is a lack of clarity regarding the western elevation glazing element. The western elevation could have the greatest impact on the street scape.

- Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association:

The proposal fails to meet the objectives of policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and SP11 of the Local Plan.

- 5.4 The following Ward Councillor made representations:

Councillor Ogiehor requested that the application was called-in to be determined by the Planning Committee unless a number of design alterations requested by a local resident were made. The applicant was notified of this, and confirmed that they did not wish to make any further amendments.

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

- There is no case for demolition of building [officer note: the dwelling can be demolished without the need for planning permission].
- There are plans for the area to become a conservation area [Officer note: the application must be determined on the current position].
- Design of the new dwelling is too bulky and is unsympathetic in appearance to the Edwardian street scene
- Loss of privacy

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. Living conditions for future occupants;
5. Basement development;
6. Parking and highway safety;
7. Impact on trees.

Principle of the development

Demolition of Existing Dwelling

- 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. Prior Approval for demolition was sought and agreed in 2018. The dwelling can therefore be demolished at any time.
- 6.3 Whilst Officers would have favoured the retention of the existing building, as was outlined in pre-application advice given, it is however accepted that the existing dwelling is in a reasonably poor condition, with signs of visible subsidence or slippage of the existing structure. As such, the applicant has pursued a scheme for demolition and replacement with a contemporary house, which seeks to be a 'reinterpretation' of the prevailing local house type.
- 6.4 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'. The principle of a redevelopment is thus acceptable.

Possible Conservation Area designation

- 6.5 A number of the third party representations received refer to how the area is under review to be considered designating a conservation area. It is accepted that a request to review the area for CA designation has been made, however the site is not designated a CA at present and the application must be dealt with on the basis of the current position. Even in Conservation Areas there is not a bar on demolition and replacement of buildings, and 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 considered.

Design and appearance

- 6.6 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.
- 6.7 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.

- 6.8 The Woodland Gardens has a residential character that includes a high degree of architectural consistency, made up largely of terraces of Edwardian houses 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 along the curve in street, beyond (east of) the junction with Connaught Gardens.
- 6.9 The 'Haringey Urban Character Study' (2015) notes that the houses on Woodland Gardens share similar characteristics with other housing stock in Muswell Hill CA. Houses in this area are defined by uniform front gardens, typically low clincker 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.
- 6.10 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 deviate slightly from the more consistent Edwardian terrace arrangement, which primarily informs the character of the street. It is also noted that the adjoined house has converted its hipped roof to a gable roof, which visually unbalances the pair.
- 6.11 As noted by third parties, the application site is prominent in location. 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.
- 6.12 As outlined in paragraph 1.2 of this report, the Inspector stated a number of reasons why he did not consider that the new dwelling would respect the character and appearance of the area. Points raised included (1) that the larger bulk and massing of the proposed building in such a prominent location would introduce an incongruous feature in the street scene; (2) the use of aluminium framed windows and unadorned timber door and surrounds without stonework or mouldings would be inconsistent with the predominant features on the neighbouring Edwardian properties; (3) this effect would be exacerbated by the physical connection with No. 78 which retains many of these original features; (4) the loss of the existing gable close to the centre of the semi-detached pair and construction of a new front-to-rear gable-ended element would unbalance the

existing symmetry of the building; and (5) the piers and screen walls on the flank elevation would be an intrusive and alien addition to the street scene. The high-level of rear glazing was also noted.

- 6.13 In response to this, the current scheme has adopted a number of alterations that seek to resolve the design concerns raised by the Inspector. The proposed development, to the front, replicates the essential elements of the existing property using durable and matching contemporary materials such as light coloured reconstituted stone, with more minimalist detailing than the originals. This indicates the true age of the proposed new house and avoids a 'pastiche'. The height, width and massing of the scheme (as revised) respects the building heights, form, scale and massing prevailing around the site.
- 6.14 The revised scheme is considered a satisfactory response to the form, design and scale of the semi it will be attached to (No 78). The front elevation has been amended to move the projecting roof gable over to the centre of the semi-detached pair (point 4 above). All glazing within the frontage would be timber framed, with a sash windows design to all but the central first floor and projecting gable units (point 2 above). The projecting front bay would be constructed in precast stone cladding and would have a sloping slate tile roof similar in form to that of its linked property no. 78 (point 3 above).
- 6.15 The glazing in the projecting gable has been centralised, and a brick corbel overhanging detail has been added underneath the gable (point 2/3). The chunky vertical millions will replicate the "half-timbering" of the original gable. The front-to-rear gable ended element has been removed from the design, and the side profile has been amended so that the main element of the building has a dual-pitch profile, with both the front and rear roof planes having an equal length and the same pitch angle. The apparent bulk of the flank elevation is reduced (point 1) and non-conforming architectural features simplified (5). The main roof will end in a gable, un-like the original house, but matching that of No.78.
- 6.16 The rear elevation includes a significant level of glazing which is not characteristic of the area, however it will not be visible from the public realm, and is not considered to warrant refusal alone.
- 6.17 The site has a shallow rear garden and as such to ensure that any future addition does not lead to excessive site coverage or affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, permitted development rights (specifically under Classes A, B and E) are recommended to be removed as part of any grant of planning permission.
- 6.18 Overall, it is considered the form, design and detailing of the proposed dwelling to be an acceptable architectural response to the site, while respecting local context and character. It is considered to address the points raised by the Inspector so as to maintain the character and appearance of the area.

- 6.19 The success of the scheme will be largely dependent on the quality of external materials. During the application negotiation, further detailing has been added to the bay window, and further details regarding materials samples (including brick, tiles and window frames) should be required to be submitted to the LPA prior to the commencement of works on site. This can be secured by way of a condition.
- 6.20 The proposed front elevation is annotated indicating that the existing clinker/brick front wall shall be retained and extended using matching materials. Further details regarding the front boundary treatment and soft landscaping can be required to be submitted to the LPA prior to the commencement of works on site, as also secured by way of a condition
- 6.21 Overall, the proposal is of acceptable quality to meet the 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 NPPF.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

- 6.22 The London Plan (2016) Policy 7.6 Architecture states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. DM Policy (2017) DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for the development's users and neighbours. The Council will support proposals that provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects (including private amenity space where required) to all parts of the development and adjacent buildings and land.
- 6.23 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.
- 6.24 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 have any materially harmful impact upon access to light or outlook of this property.
- 6.25 Objections have been received with regards 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.
- 6.26 The current proposal has an increased level of glazing in the rear elevation of the second floor in comparison to 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 by the occupants of properties on Theresa Walk.

- 6.27 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. 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 that 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 can be applied that requires 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.
- 6.28 The inclusion of glazing in the front gable, albeit it would be positioned at a higher level in comparison to first floor windows, would not materially affect the privacy of neighbouring occupiers. The glazing would be located approximately 20 metres away from the front upper floor windows of adjacent properties on the other side of Woodland Gardens. Within an urban context, it is accepted that there are degrees of mutual overlooking from first floor windows and the proposal would not result in harm over-and-above that found within such a setting. As such, this window would not materially worsen privacy levels over and above the current situation.
- 6.29 The proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact upon the amenities of neighbouring occupants, and complies with policies 7.6 and DM1. It is also noted that the appeal Inspector did not find harm to adjacent properties.

Quality of Residential Accommodation

- 6.30 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.
- 6.31 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.

- 6.32 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

- 6.33 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.
- 6.34 The applicant's 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.

Parking and highway safety

- 6.35 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'.
- 6.36 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 would 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.

- 6.37 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.
- 6.38 Subject to compliance with a condition regarding Construction Logistics Plan, the proposal is acceptable with regards to highways and transportation considerations.

Basement Impact Assessment

- 6.39 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.
- 6.40 A Basement Impact Assessment (including desk study and ground investigation) has been submitted with this application, as well as a Structural Engineering Report (prepared by AMA Consulting Engineers).
- 6.41 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.
- 6.42 A 'Construction Technique and Methodology for the Lowering of the Existing Basement' is provided. The Structural Engineering Report outline 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.

- 6.43 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.
- 6.44 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.
- 6.45 The information provided has been assessed and is considered satisfactory. A condition should be imposed to ensure that the structural side of the basement is overseen by a suitably qualified chartered engineer.
- 6.46 In conclusion and subject to imposing 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

- 6.47 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.
- 6.48 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

- 6.49 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.

- 6.50 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.
- 6.51 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

- 6.52 The development would replace an existing family-sized dwelling. Following revision, it is considered that the form, design and detailing of the proposed dwelling is an acceptable architectural response to the site, while respecting local context and character. It is considered to have generally addressed the points by the Planning Inspector in dismissing the previous appeal on this site, to a point whereby it is considered to comply with policy. It would provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation and would not result in an unacceptable impact upon neighbouring amenity. Subject to compliance with conditions, it would not prejudice existing road conditions or have an unacceptable impact upon highway or pedestrian safety.
- 6.53 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

7.0 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. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

GRANT PERMISSION subject to conditions subject to conditions in Appendix 1

Applicant's drawing No.(s)

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 accordance with the following approved plans and specifications:

A-00-001 rev. 11, A-03-114-01 rev. 12, A-03-114-02 rev. 12, A-03-114-03 rev. 12, A-03-112-02 rev. 11, A-03-112-01 rev. 11, A-03-112-03 rev. 11, A-03-132-01 rev. 12, A-03-132-03 rev. 12, A-03-132-02 rev. 12, A-03-132-05 rev. 12, A-03-132-04 rev. 12, A-03-133-01 rev. 12, A-03-133-02 rev. 12, A-03-133-03 rev. 12, A-03-133-04 rev. 12, A-03-133-05 rev. 12, A-03-133-06 rev. 12, A-03-133-07 rev. 12, A-03-133-08 rev. 12, Structural Engineering Report by AMA Consulting Engineers ref: AMA_REP_01 rev 01 Prepared Jul 2017

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

The development shall only be carried out using the agreed materials.

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 - 12) 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 – 12) 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.

Informatives:

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	Comment	Response
INTERNAL		
Design Officer	<p>These proposals replace an existing house in a street of a high degree of architectural consistency, and are to replace a previously refused design for a new contemporary replacement house. The existing house on the site of this application has lost some of its consistency with the rest of the street, as its brickwork has been painted white, it has also become apparently structurally weakened. Also as it is not Listed or part of a Conservation Area, there is no policy to prevent demolition.</p> <p>The refused proposal contained elements referencing and evoking the existing building & it's neighbours, but mixed, reinterpreted and inverted. This revised scheme follows the existing & neighbouring form much more closely, especially where it is visible from the street, it's North (front) & West (side) elevations.</p> <p>The front replicates the essential elements of the existing; the projecting, angled, ground floor window, projecting from the gabled 2&1/2 floor projection to the left of the house, matching it's adjoining twin, the central single storey porch over the front door & vertically divided double windows to their right, with overhanging eaves and gabled matching the existing, but in high quality, durable and matching contemporary materials such as light coloured reconstituted stone & metal in place of white painted timber & render in the originals (& with a matching brick & roof tiles; the primary materials), and with more minimalist detailing than the originals; indicating the true age of the proposed new house,</p>	Noted.

Stakeholder	Comment	Response
	<p>providing cleaner lines and greater transparency for residents. The gable will be glazed rather than rendered, giving the residents a sitting area with unparalleled views of Alexandra Palace, but the chunky vertical millions will replicate the "half-timbering" of the existing gable. In what will probably be the single most visible element of the new house to passers-by, the new garden wall will replicate the distinctive & unusual original clinker brick rubble wall.</p> <p>The side (west) elevation will also contribute strongly to its appearance from the street, as there is a wider gap from this house's parking space and the back garden of its western neighbour, a corner house, but it will not be as visible as the front. The roof will end in a gable rather than a hip, which will match better its "pair", which has had a hip-to-gable extension, which can be done under Permitted Development. The whole gable is expressed in the design, with those parts of the rear of the proposed house that are deeper or taller than the original, set back and differentiated by change of plane. A panel of patterned brickwork, in part concealing an obscured-glazed window, will add interest and craftsmanship to the otherwise blank gable.</p> <p>The rear, by contrast, will not be visible from the public realm (& will be barely visible from neighbours private gardens, given the density of vegetation), so is not a concern for Design Officers. Distance and the aforementioned vegetation will prevent any concern of loss of privacy to neighbours.</p> <p>This substantially revised proposed new house has a design that is a close and faithful contemporary reinterpretation of the consistent existing houses of this</p>	

Stakeholder	Comment	Response
	<p>street, especially its front, where all the main elements and many key details and materials will be replicated or reinterpreted in more contemporary, more minimalist but in appearance matching form, will enable it to sit comfortably in the street, whilst still being readable, when examined closely, as of this age. The quality and durability of the proposed materials, detailing and internal layout will ensure it keeps looking good and being loved, more than the severely degraded and harmfully altered existing house at this site. For most people, it will appear as just another of the consistent, high quality and much loved houses of this distinctive residential street, but when looked at more closely, be an example of how more contemporary architectural reinterpretation can also provide high quality homes.</p>	
Transport	<p>The proposal is modest in size and nature and in my opinion will not give rise to any material transport and highway impacts. An on-lot car parking space is provided, utilising the existing vehicle crossover. The minimum dimensions for a car parking space is satisfied. 3 no cycle parking spaces are include, which meets London Plan requirements. A condition securing cycle parking as approved will need to be secured. A Construction Management Plan will need to be secured.</p>	Noted.
EXTERNAL		
Woodland Conservation Area Action Group	<p>The proposed design would diminish the quality and delight of the Edwardian area. A number of design alterations were raised as suggestions to improve the design quality of the scheme.</p>	The design merits of the proposal are discussed at paragraphs 6.6 – 6.23.

Stakeholder	Comment	Response
	There is a lack of clarity regarding the western elevation glazing element	
	The development would be excessive in scale and over-dominant in the street scene and would have no architectural merit.	
Muswell Hill CAAC	The area is currently under consideration for inclusion within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. It is therefore important that the design does not detract from the appearance of the street and would make a positive contribution to the appearance and character of the conservation area.	This matter is addressed at paragraph 6.5 of the report.
	The north elevation was considered to be a crude pastiche lacking essential detailing. The western elevation could have the greatest impact on the street scape.	The design merits of the proposal are addressed between paragraphs 6.6 – 6.23.
Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association	The proposal fails to meet the objectives of policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD, policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and SP11 of the Local Plan.	The design merits of the proposal are addressed between paragraphs 6.6 – 6.23.
NEIGHBOURING PROPERTIES	No case for demolition of building	This issue is addressed at paragraphs 6.2 – 6.6.
	There are plans for the area to become a conservation area	This issue is addressed at paragraph 6.5 of the report.
	Design of the new dwelling is too bulky and is unsympathetic in appearance to the Edwardian street scene	The design merits of the proposal are addressed between paragraphs 6.6 – 6.23.
	Loss of privacy	Issues of privacy are addressed in paragraphs 6.25 – 6.30.

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 of the frontage of the dwelling



Visual of the proposed dwelling

