

ADDENDUM REPORT FOR ITEMS

UPDATE FOR CONSIDERATION AT PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE Item No. 8

Reference No: HGY/2019/1183	Ward: Alexandra
Address: 1-6 Crescent Mews N22 7GG	
Proposal: Demolition of the existing buildings, retention of slab level, perimeter wall along northern boundary of site, and wall adjacent to Dagmar Road gardens, and redevelopment of the site to provide two 3 storey blocks fronting Crescent Mews, a 1 to 2 storey block adjacent to Dagmar Road and a 4 storey building to the rear comprising 30 residential units (Use Class C3), including 3 disabled car parking spaces, associated landscaping and cycle parking within the development and a new paved and landscaped lane at the front of the development with street lighting. Installation of vehicle and pedestrian access gates at entrance to mews and erection of boundary treatment to the rear of the commercial units.	
Applicant: Mr Herskovic	
Ownership: Private	

4.0 CONSULTATION (UPDATE)

4.2.3 Further internal consultation response received Council's Design Officer subsequent to receipt of additional objections post his original comments.

Design Officer

Further comments:

The London Plan and Mayor's Housing SPG sets out three character settings; Suburban, Urban and Central, to help decisions on selecting appropriate density ranges in conjunction with PTAL and habitable room mix. The definition of Urban in the London Plan is: "areas with predominantly dense development such as, for example, terraced houses, mansion blocks, a mix of different uses, medium building footprints and typically buildings of two to four storeys, located within 800 metres walking distance of a District centre or, along main arterial routes", whilst Suburban is: "areas with predominantly lower density development such as, for example, detached and semi-detached houses, predominantly residential, small building footprints and typically buildings of two to three storeys".

The majority of the borough is considered 'urban' in character, with some suburban areas to the north and west. The site is within a wider area assessed as of Urban character:

- 4.2.4 **Environmental Health (Noise):** does not object to the proposed development subject to standard conditions regarding noise insulation as well as performance against appropriate noise levels.

I have reviewed the information submitted in respect of the above development, including the Residential planning noise and vibration report (Ref: 18251-R01-E). We are satisfied with the assessment undertaken regarding impacts from railway land at the rear of the site and that mitigation can be addressed conditionally as part of any permission granted.

The applicant specifies that the performance of the sound insulation required at each facade will depend on a range of elements. We will require the applicant to confirm design and construction of the solid elements, the ventilation strategy and the glazing specification prior to the commencement of the construction phase of the development. This will be subject to review and approval of the local authority before any works commence.

We accept that the predicted vibration dose values are well below the threshold requiring intervention or mitigation and therefore that no specialist isolation measures are required to control vibration at the site.

We do not require any further information to secure the above at this stage but request that conditions are attached to any permission granted [specific conditions recommended – see below].

5.0 LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS (UPDATE)

- 5.4 A further objection (Appendix 2) from a planning consultant on behalf of 15 nearby households has also been received on 8 November 2019 and is reproduced below in full. The submission reiterates previous issues raised primarily relating to the impact of proposed Block C and D of the residential amenities of several properties on Dagmar Road and Crescent Road.
- 5.5 Officers consider that the submission does not raise any material considerations that have not already been addressed in the committee report and the Design Officer's additional comments as detailed at paragraph 4.2.3 of this addendum report. Similarly, a further objection received from an existing objector reiterates points regarding fire brigade access and impact on amenities.

9.0 RECOMMENDATION (additional conditions)

- 32. Condition: The dwellings hereby approved shall be insulated against noise before the dwellings are occupied. A scheme providing such insulation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any building work commences on the site. The insulation provided shall ensure that the noise level within the units does not exceed:**
- **30-40dB LAeq for living rooms (07.00 hours - 23.00 hours);**
 - **30-35dB LAeq for bedrooms (23.00 hours – 07.00 hours);**
 - **45dB LAmax for individual noise events in bedrooms (23.00 hours – 07.00 hours).**

Reason: To maintain reasonable levels of protection for the occupiers of the development from external noise.

- 33. Condition: Any noise associated with plant and machinery incorporated within the development shall be controlled such that the rating level measured or calculated 1-metre from the façade of the nearest existing noise sensitive premises, shall not exceed a level 5dB below the existing LA90 background noise level and in accordance with guidance provided in BS 4142:2014.**

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of local residents.

Appendix: Additional submission - Planning Consultant acting for 15 residents

Our Ref: SJB/sd/19031_03

8 November 2019

«Title» «Initial» «Last_Name»

Haringey Council
River Park House
225 High Road
Wood Green
London
N22 8HQ

By Email Only: «Email»

Dear «Name2»

Demolition of Existing Buildings and Erection of 1, 3 & 4 Storey Block etc 1-6 Crescent Mews, London N22 7GG - LPA Ref: HGY/2019/1183

We are instructed by residents of properties (addressees listed below) which adjoin this site to object on their behalf. In this regard, we submitted comprehensive objections in June and I attach a copy. Whilst some minor revisions to drawings have been made subsequently, the thrust of those objections remain and without repeating them, this letter highlights particular aspects which ignore or fail to appreciate the relationship between the site and its surroundings.

At the outset, the neighbours have asked me to point out that they are neither objecting to the principle of redevelopment nor a residential reuse of this site. They also fully understand that as elected members, you must act in the public good and that the provision of much needed new homes, including affordable provision, is at the heart of your Council's ambitions. Equally, that must not be at the cost of an unreasonable impact upon existing adjoining occupants or indeed the quality of the new housing to be provided.

Your officers have presented you with a detailed and comprehensive report, but we remain of the view that aspects of the scheme are unacceptable. The project architect has shown innovation and ingenuity, but our principal concern remains. In short, increasing the bulk and height of the blocks within the site and in particular, turning it from being wholly inward looking to partly outward looking remains unacceptable in terms of the interface with existing properties in Dagmar Road and Crescent Road. In presentational terms, this is not helped by application drawings which do not show the full extent of surrounding properties, some artistic licence (the rear outriggers to the Dagmar Road properties consistently shown in outline and not shaded) and the failure to plot existing



Barker Parry Town Planning Ltd

33 Bancroft, Hitchin,
Herts SG5 1LA
T: 01462 420 224
E: office@barkerparry.co.uk
W: www.barkerparry.co.uk

Steven Barker:
Director (Managing)
MA (Cantab) MA MRTPI

Gae Parry:
Director (Consultant)
BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Liz Fitzgerald:
Director
BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Registered:
England & Wales No. 5314018.
Registered Office same as
office address





structures (the fact that the shop at 11 Crescent Road extends right up to the alley outside proposed Units 5 and 4). I believe that members have already carried out a site visit and hopefully you have realised such matters.

It is the introduction of the 'alley' street scene and the outward facing nature of Units 7-1 which is unacceptable and a clear manifestation of trying to fit a quart into a pint pot. It is acknowledged that the applicants and your officers have calculated density figures for the scheme, but these are an index of the acceptability of a proposal in a given location and one also has to look at the way a proposal relates to its surroundings.

Our earlier submission drew attention to the aspects of Blocks D (parallel with Dagmar Road) and C (parallel with Crescent Road) that illustrate manifestations of overdevelopment. If we could refer you specifically to two paragraphs of the report before you, namely 6.5.21 and 6.7.10.

6.5.21 - under the heading Bulk and Massing Block D is described as:

"essentially of a single storey height, with a small area of two storey where it abuts Block C. It, therefore, reads as subsidiary to the two storey terraced houses fronting Crescent and Dagmar Roads, and would read as like garden structures and buildings behind garden walls..."

We do not recognise that description of Block D and would ask you to look at the site layout plan and drawings JW 865-160D and JW 865-162D. The floor plan shows quite clearly that Block D comprises Units 6, 7 and 8. Unit 6 comprises at least one third of the footprint and is a three-bed, five-person, two storey house and does not represent a "garden structure". It can be seen on A1 Front Elevation and D Side Elevation.

On A1 Front Elevation (JW865-160D), the shading, or rather lack of, on the rear outriggers at the Dagmar Road flats gives a misleading impression of the separation distances to Block D, which is compounded by the flats all but being missed off the layout plans. For the avoidance of doubt, the single storey element of D is only 7.5m from the rear of the flats and the two-storey element (Unit 6), which presents as a gable under the ridge of a mono-pitched roof, is only 15m distant. As can be seen on A1, this ridge is higher than the outriggers and higher than the eaves of the main roof at Dagmar Road. Again, "garden structures", which is assumed to mean incidental structures built under permitted development rights, can never be this tall.

At paragraph 6.7.10, under the heading Privacy and Outlook, we can see little, if any, addressing of concerns we raised in June concerning intervisibility between Units 7-1 and existing properties in Dagmar and Crescent Roads. It is important to remember that irrespective of mutual overlooking between these existing and longstanding dwellings, there is currently **none** between them and the



application site buildings. This is because the current buildings on the site, which post-date the terraces by many years, are not only much lower, but also turn their backs on the dwellings. A point which the applicants, and indeed your officers, do not appear to comprehend or, if they do, attach insufficient weight.

Just because the existing properties are relatively dense and the occupants can already see one another does not justify introducing facing windows at such close proximity. It is important to understand just how close these proposed openings (which introduce noise and not just privacy concerns) are to the existing dwellings.

The windows in Block D are not, as is reported, "over 20m" from the Dagmar Road properties. The windows in Unit 6 are, in fact, 15 and 18m distant and only in Unit 5 are they more than 20m away. The latter do include second floor windows, which though 'blinker' to Crescent Road, nonetheless look straight across to Dagmar Road. Unfortunately, the flats do not feature on the plans having been cut off.

We can see no mention of the private amenity space for Units 6 and 7 despite objecting previously. Sizeable decks are proposed outside bi-fold doors (please see drawing JW865-150G) to habitable rooms in these dwellings. The deck is within 6m of the rear of flats in Crescent Road and the doors and open rooms beyond, within 9m.

A garden fence may well prevent intervisibility at ground floor, but not disturbance from noise. It will, however, do nothing to prevent intervisibility between the deck and rooms and the upper floors at Crescent Road, which we consider to be quite unacceptable for either existing or new residents. These amenity areas are being squeezed in where presently Block D presents a blank wall to Crescent Road. Units 6 and 7 may be creative design, but ultimately, they exemplify unacceptable overdevelopment.

Paragraph 6.7.9 also refers to Block C in respect of which we commented previously. We remain concerned that this is not a location to create a new street scene facing, and at close quarters to, the backs of commercial premises in Crescent Road. You have hopefully seen this part of the site during your site visit and in particular the proximity of 11 Crescent Road to the alley. Your officers consider it to be acceptable, but we remain concerned that it is an unattractive and unacceptable outlook/approach for these large family houses which, being social housing, are likely to be fully occupied.

Principle aside, we note that the balconies at first and second floors remain in Unit 4 and indeed Unit 2. Those at Unit 4 are no more than 12m from the upper floors of living accommodation at Crescent Road. These are not even windows but balconies that people can stand on and look across to the neighbours. Their sole purpose seems to allow offset clear glazing to the bedrooms, but in giving

outlook for the new occupants of these family houses, it has created a knock-on problem. Again, "creative", but symptomatic of unreasonably intensive development.

We ask that in considering the proposal on Monday, you look at the points raised above. We believe they warrant rejection of the scheme on the grounds that elements of Blocks C and D unreasonably compromise the amenity of both existing and future residents.

On behalf of the existing residents, thank you for the time taken to read this letter and attachment.

Yours sincerely



Steven Barker

Director (Managing)

steven@barkerparry.co.uk

Att'd: Letter 19031_02, 5 June 2019

cc: Mr T Finlayson (tobias.finlayson@haringey.gov.uk)

Neighbours Represented:

Crescent Road 13, 17, 21, 25, 31, 35, 37, 41

Dagmar Road 2, 4, 6, 8, 14, 16, 22

