LIST OF RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Reference No: HGY/2016/2101 **Ward:** Muswell Hill

Date received: 23/06/2016

Drawing number of plans: AD-99-HILL, AD-100-HILL & AD-101-HILL

Address: St Lukes Woodside Hospital Woodside Avenue N10 3JA

Proposal: Listed building consent for the conversion and refurbishment of the existing Grade 2 Listed administration building into five dwellings with associated landscaping

Applicant: Mr Brian Scally Hill Residential

Ownership: Private

Site Visit Date: 21/10/2016

Officer contact: Aaron Lau

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT subject to conditions

Conditions:

1) Development begun no later than three years from date of decision
2) In accordance with approved plans
3) Materials to match existing

Informatives:

1) Land ownership
2) Hours of construction

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is Listed building consent application for the conversion and refurbishment of the existing Grade 2 Listed administration building into five dwellings with associated landscaping. The significant works to the listed building has approved under the previous listed building consent application. The proposal under this application are limited to internal works only and as follows,

AD1

- Kitchen enlarged by reducing width of w.c. and adjusting service ‘riser’.
- Minor amendments to the internal layout indicating double beds in the bedrooms rather than two single beds.
- Bedroom 1 to have existing chimney breast removed to create flush wall.
- Bath omitted form Bathroom and Shower added.
- Store added under stairs.

AD2

- Entrance hall and adjacent w.c. ‘swapped’ to place w.c. adjacent to external wall.
- Door added to opening from living room into upper hall.
- Existing door within Kitchen/dining (ref E03) to be retained and either the door being removed and used elsewhere or retained in-situ. If the door is removed then the opening to be in-filled with plasterboard both sides.
- Minor amendments to the internal layout indicating double beds in the bedrooms rather than two single beds.
- Store added under stairs, lower level.
- Door added to opening into Bedroom 3 and Bathroom.

AD3

- Form a single, wider, opening between the dining and living area. Omit proposed opening adjacent to external wall.
- Increase the width of the opening from the dining area to the Kitchen
- Store removed from adjacent to the stair to AD4 (Shown on Ground Floor Plan adjacent to AD3) to provide more space around stair.
- Adjust wall position between Bedrooms 1 and 2 to maximize size of Bedroom 1.
- Add open shelves to En-suite Shower Room.
- Double beds shown in bedrooms in lieu of two single beds.

AD4

- Open up existing wall between kitchen and Living/Dining room to create more open kitchen off living / dining. Width of new opening to be from external wall, with minimum projecting nib, to side of existing door surround. Door and surround to be retained on Living/Dining side of wall and opening infill with plasterboard / stud on kitchen side to create flush wall for kitchen units.
- Change En-suite Bathroom to En-suite Shower Room.
- Change Shower Room to Bathroom and adjust location of wall between Ensuite Shower Room and Bathroom to suit.
- Show double beds in bedroom and adjust electrical layout to suit.

AD5

- Bedroom Two to become location of Kitchen with Bedroom Three being re-allocated Bedroom Two. Currently approved kitchen location to be re-allocated as Bedroom Three.
- Revise layout of the Bathroom and En-suite Shower room to provide a simplified layout.

- Enlarge Bedroom 3 as a result of adjustments to Bathroom and En-suite Shower Room.
- Show double beds in bedroom in lieu of two single beds.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The former St Lukes Woodside Hospital occupies a roughly rectangular site, and included the Simmons House Adolescent Unit, though this fell outside the planning application red line boundary.

3.3 The site is bounded to the south by Woodside Avenue, to the east by Muswell Hill Road (Nos. 73-97), to the north by Grand Avenue (Nos. 10-50) and to the west by TreeHouse School. The application site includes the tennis court associated with the hospital, situated on the southern side of Woodside Avenue.

3.4 The application site includes three heritage buildings fronting Woodside Avenue, two of which (Roseneath and Norton Lees) are locally listed, whilst the central one (the Administration Block) is a Grade II listed building. In addition the site includes a number of the original hospital buildings (kitchens, treatment block, mortuary block and two east and west ward blocks), together with a number of more modern buildings located to the north of Simmons House (namely Duston, Willow and Hazel Wood Houses).

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- HGY/2015/2702 - Listed Building Consent for the conversion and refurbishment of the existing Grade 2 listed administration building into five dwellings with associated landscaping – approved 11/11/2015

- HGY/2013/2380 - Listed Building Consent for demolition of the buildings on site excluding the Grade II listed Administration building and locally listed buildings (Roseneath and Norton Lees); refurbishment of listed buildings including extension of Roseneath and Norton Lees and construction of 8 apartment blocks to provide a total of 135 units and including a basement car park with 100 spaces; construction of 21 houses (17 terraced and 4 semi-detached) and 5 apartment units; and comprehensive landscaping of the site – approved 24/04/2014.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

4.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- Muswell Hill/Fortis Green/Rookfield CAAC
- LBH Conservation Officer
- L. B. Barnet
- Historic England
- Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Residents Association

The following responses were received:

Internal:

1) LBH Conservation Officer: No objection.

"The proposals would have no greater impact than the already approved drawings on the significant of the listed and locally listed assets or their setting or the conservation area."

External:

2) Historic England: No comments.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site. 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: 0
Objecting: 0
Supporting: 0

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. The impact of the proposed development on the statutorily listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area

6.1 The impact of the proposed development on the statutorily listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area

Statutory test

6.1.1 Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 provides:

"*In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority or, as the case may be, the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses*".

6.1.2 "*In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area."* Among the provisions referred to in subsection (2) are "*the planning Acts*".

6.1.3 The Barnwell Manor Wind Farm Energy Limited v East Northamptonshire District Council case tells us that "*Parliament in enacting section 66(1) did intend that the desirability of preserving listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but should be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise."*

6.1.4 The Government in the case of the Queen (on the application of The Forge Field Society) v Sevenoaks District Council says that the duties in Sections 66 and 72 of the Listed Buildings Act do not allow a Local Planning Authority to treat the desirability of preserving of listed buildings and the character and appearance of conservation areas as mere material considerations to which it can simply attach such weight as it sees fit. If there was any doubt about this before the decision in Barnwell, it has now been firmly dispelled. When an authority finds that a proposed development would harm the setting of a listed building or the character or appearance of a conservation area or a Historic Park, it must give that harm considerable importance and weight. This does not mean that an authority's assessment of likely harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area is other than a matter for its own planning judgment. It does not mean that the weight the authority should give to harm which it considers would be limited or less than substantial must be the same as the weight it might give to harm which would be substantial. But it is to recognise, as the Court of Appeal emphasized in Barnwell, that a finding of harm to the setting of a listed building or to a conservation area gives rise to a strong presumption against planning permission being granted. The presumption is a statutory one, but it is not irrebuttable. It can be outweighed by material considerations powerful enough to do so. An authority can only properly strike the balance between harm to a heritage asset on the one hand and planning benefits on the other if it is conscious of the statutory presumption in favour of preservation and if it demonstrably applies that presumption to the proposal it is considering.

6.1.5 In short, there is a requirement that the impact of the proposal on the heritage assets be very carefully considered, that is to say that any harm or benefit needs to be assessed individually in order to assess and come to a conclusion on the overall heritage position. If the overall heritage assessment concludes that the proposal is harmful then that should be given "*considerable importance and weight*" in the final balancing exercise having regard to other material considerations which would need to carry greater weight in order to prevail.

6.1.6 Paragraph 132 of the NPPF states that, *'When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification.'*

6.1.7 Paragraph 134 of the NPPF goes on to say, '*where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use'*.

6.1.8 The NPPF should be considered alongside with London Plan 2011 Policies 3.5 and 7.6 and Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11, which identifies that all development proposals should respect their surroundings by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.

6.1.9 London Plan Policy 7.8 requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and

architectural detail. Haringey Local Plan Policy SP12 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets.

6.1.10 Saved UDP Policy CSV4 require that alterations or extensions to listed buildings: a) are necessary and are not detrimental to the architectural and historical integrity and detailing of a listed building's interior and exterior; b) relate sensitively to the original building; and c) do not adversely affect the setting of a listed building.

6.1.11 This Administration building, dating from 1928-30, is a two storey building with a wide symmetrical frontage and with classical detailing. It was designated a Statutory Listed Grade II on 11th May 2009.It is built in red brickwork with a Portland stone cornice and a central colonnaded entrance with a classical pediment above. Its central clock tower, weathervane and chimneys are attractive features on its hipped roof. The two adjacent locally listed Victorian buildings include Norton Lees to the east of the Administration building and Roseneath to the west.

6.1.12 Works proposed to the basement, staircase and where the retention of the wall and the opening were granted listed building consent in 2015. This current listed building consent is for internal works only, and is for the following,

AD1

- Kitchen enlarged by reducing width of w.c. and adjusting service 'riser'.
- Minor amendments to the internal layout indicating double beds in the bedrooms rather than two single beds.
- Bedroom 1 to have existing chimney breast removed to create flush wall.
- Bath omitted form Bathroom and Shower added.
- Store added under stairs.

AD2

- Entrance hall and adjacent w.c. 'swapped' to place w.c. adjacent to external wall.
- Door added to opening from living room into upper hall.
- Existing door within Kitchen/dining (ref E03) to be retained and either the door being removed and used elsewhere or retained in-situ. If the door is removed then the opening to be in-filled with plasterboard both sides.
- Minor amendments to the internal layout indicating double beds in the bedrooms rather than two single beds.
- Store added under stairs, lower level.
- Door added to opening into Bedroom 3 and Bathroom.

AD3

- Form a single, wider, opening between the dining and living area. Omit proposed opening adjacent to external wall.
- Increase the width of the opening from the dining area to the Kitchen
- Store removed from adjacent to the stair to AD4 (Shown on Ground Floor Plan adjacent to AD3) to provide more space around stair.
- Adjust wall position between Bedrooms 1 and 2 to maximize size of Bedroom 1.
- Add open shelves to En-suite Shower Room.
- Double beds shown in bedrooms in lieu of two single beds.

AD4

- Open up existing wall between kitchen and Living/Dining room to create more open kitchen off living / dining. Width of new opening to be from external wall, with minimum projecting nib, to side of existing door surround. Door and surround to be retained on Living/Dining side of wall and opening infill with plasterboard / stud on kitchen side to create flush wall for kitchen units.
- Change En-suite Bathroom to En-suite Shower Room.
- Change Shower Room to Bathroom and adjust location of wall between Ensuite Shower Room and Bathroom to suit.
- Show double beds in bedroom and adjust electrical layout to suit.

AD5

- Bedroom Two to become location of Kitchen with Bedroom Three being re-allocated Bedroom Two. Currently approved kitchen location to be re-allocated as Bedroom Three.
- Revise layout of the Bathroom and En-suite Shower room to provide a simplified layout.
- Enlarge Bedroom 3 as a result of adjustments to Bathroom and En-suite Shower Room.
- Show double beds in bedroom in lieu of two single beds.

6.1.13 The Council's Conservation Officer has reviewed the minor amendments to the listed building and raised no objection.

6.1.14 In summary, the proposed development, by virtue of its minor nature would not be anymore harmful (less than substantial harm) than the consented listed building works in 2015 which would preserve the significance and longevity of the listed building. The 'less than substantial harm' would be outweighed by the provision of a high quality and better configured accommodation to enable the building's conversion to residential use in meeting the above policy framework.

6.2 Conclusions

- The internal works proposed under this Listed Building consent for the conversion and refurbishment of the existing Grade II listed administration building are minor in nature and would be no more harmful than the 2015 listed building consent, and as such it would preserve the special character and longevity of the building. The The 'less than substantial harm' would be outweighed by the provision of a high quality residential accommodation which would satisfy the statutory duties set out in Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and accord to the design and conservation aims and objectives as set out in the NPPF, London Plan Policies 7.4, 7.5 and 7.6, saved UDP Policy UD3, Local Plan Policies SP11 and SP12 and SPG2 'Conservation and archaeology'.

- 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. CIL APPLICABLE

- There will be no increase in internal floor area which would exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

GRANT LISTED BUILDING CONSENT subject to conditions

Registered No. HGY/2016/2101

Applicant's drawing No.(s) AD-99-HILL, AD-100-HILL & AD-101-HILL

Subject to the following condition(s)

1. The works hereby permitted shall be begun not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To accord with the provisions of Section 18 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The approved plans comprise drawing nos (AD-99-HILL, AD-100-HILL & AD-101-HILL). The development shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans except where conditions attached to this planning permission indicate otherwise or where alternative details have been subsequently approved following an application for a non-material amendment.

Reason: In order to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details and in the interests of amenity.

3. Prior to commencement of works hereby approved a schedule of repair works and methodology statement to undertake all the works including those relating to the insertion of internal partitions and removal of existing walls and partitions should be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Council.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

4. All new works and works of making good to the retained fabric, whether internal or external, shall be finished to match the adjacent work with regard to the methods used and to material, colour, texture and profile.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

5. Any hidden historic features (internal or external) which are revealed during the course of works shall be retained in situ, work suspended in the relevant area of the building and the Council as local planning authority notified immediately. Provision shall be made for the retention and/or proper recording, as required by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.

6. Prior to commencement of the relevant part of the works hereby approved, details of all joinery including the porch and all internal and external doors, frames, architraves,

windows, cornices and skirtings at an appropriate scale (1:5) should be 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.

7. Prior to commencement of the relevant part of the works hereby approved, all materials including external cladding, metal and any masonry should be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All materials for making good the existing fabric should match the existing building, including the mortar. This should be an appropriate lime based mortar such as 1:2:9 (Cement: lime: aggregate) and match existing mortar in colour and texture.

Reason: In order to safeguard the special architectural or historic interest of the building.