

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4073
Type	Full planning permission
Location	Shop B, 59 Park Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8DP
Proposal	Installation of two semi-circular Dutch awnings to shopfront and relocation of existing hanging sign.
Case Officer	James Mead
Valid Date	10/11/2022
Applicant	Mr Ali Serdaroglu
Agent	mr Halil Seker

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

2.1 This is an application for the installation of two semi-circle awnings onto the front of the building. The awnings would project out from the building and overhang the footway. These works would result in a need to relocate an existing hanging sign.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The application site comprises of a three storey building, which is in retail use at ground floor (use class: E) and the upper floors appear to be occupied as flats. The premises is located on the south-western side of Park Road. At ground floor this stretch of Park Road is mainly made up of shopfronts and some entrances to flats. The site is situated within the Crouch End District Town Centre and is on a Secondary Shopping Frontage. The setting is typical of a town centre location, with a mixture of retail, commercial, community and residential uses present in the locality. The building is of late 20th century age and is within the Crouch End Conservation Area (CA).

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

2.3 The most recent relevant planning history relating to the site is as follows:

- HGY/2020/2297: Installation of two semi-circular awning to the front elevation of shop. Refused.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

1) LBH Conservation Officer: Objects to the application. The intrinsic architectural quality of the building and the relatively well-preserved, almost uncluttered townscape along the west side of Park Road are established, positive characteristics of this stretch of the Conservation Area, whereas the proposed canopies are uncharacteristic of the host building and its Conservation Area

location and would also obscure the arched windows, which are a key feature of the host building. The bulky awnings would clutter the composition of the facade and would very undesirably dominate as an anomaly in views of the Conservation Area along Park Road. The host building does not have a traditional shopfront, as such its facade is not designed to seamlessly incorporate fascia signage, lighting or awnings.

2) LBH Transportation: The proposed awnings will project over the public footway. It should be clarified whether a license exists for retail use on the footway. The headroom to the proposed awnings has not been specified. However, the proposals as illustrated appear to provide for less than the minimum required headroom clearance of 2.4 metres.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The application has been publicised by way of site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 20 letters. 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

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design, Appearance & Heritage; and
2. Transport & Pedestrian Safety.

Design, Appearance & Heritage

5.2 London Plan Policy D3 notes that proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Local Plan Policy SP11 outlines that proposals should be of a high standard of design that respects local context, character and historic significance. Proposals should relate positively to their locality and should achieve a high standard of design, contributing to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area, in line with DM DPD Policy DM1.

5.3 In regard to proposals in CAs, the Local Planning Authority has a statutory duty to ensure that the historic significance of these heritage assets is preserved or enhanced. London Plan Policy HC1, Local Plan Policy SP12 and DM DPD Policy DM9 require proposals to conserve the historic significance and setting of CAs. Proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings in CAs should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building, in line with DM DPD Policy DM9.

5.4 It is noted that the Crouch End CA Appraisal does not identify the host building as a positive contributor to the character of the CA. However, the Conservation Officer outlines that 'the building retains much of its original facade composition and historic character and should be considered as a positive contributor to the Conservation Area'. Noting these comments, and given the clear late-Victorian appearance of the building, officers do not agree with the assessment of the CA Appraisal. Instead, the building is of heritage value, incorporating distinctive features, and as such is considered to contribute positively to the character of the CA.

5.5 The building does not have a traditional shopfront and instead incorporates semi-circle, arched windows at the front. The historic architectural form of the building means that it was not designed to incorporate features such as awnings. The proposed scheme has failed to acknowledge this and the proposed awnings would instead appear as bulky, modern and unsympathetic features on the front elevation. In addition, the Conservation Officer notes that the awnings would block views of the arched windows, which are key features of the building. The obscuring of the arched windows means that the awnings would further detract from the appearance of the building. The awnings would appear incongruous, in relation to the key architectural features of the building, and would overall not respect the historic character of the building.

5.6 The other entrances/shopfronts within the building to the north-west remain uncluttered, with no awnings or fascia signage blocking views of the facade. The shops on the opposite side of Park Road and to the south-east have more typical shopfronts, which allow for the provision of signage. Whilst this is acknowledged, none of these shopfronts in the locality incorporate circular awnings. Noting the well-preserved, uncluttered form of the existing building, and given the lack of any comparable awnings in the vicinity, it is considered that the proposed awnings would appear alien in this context. The awnings would dominate as an anomaly along this stretch of Park Road and would appear out of keeping in this part of the CA.

5.7 Overall, in design and heritage terms, it is considered that the awnings would appear as dominant, modern features, which would fail to respect the historic appearance and architectural features of the host building. The awnings would appear as alien and incongruous additions to the street scene, failing to reflect the historic character of the CA. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the CA. The historic significance of the CA would be harmed, with the special interest of this heritage asset not preserved.

Transport & Pedestrian Safety

5.8 London Plan Policy D8 outlines that the movement function of the public realm should be secured. DM DPD Policy DM2 notes that proposals should protect and improve safe pedestrian routes and should not impede pedestrian permeability.

5.9 The proposed awnings would project over the highway at a height of approximately 2.25 metres. It is noted that the Transportation Officer has recommended that the awnings should provide a headroom clearance of 2.4 metres above the pavement. If this application were to be approved, officers would have required a minor change to the design of the awnings to provide sufficient headroom. Subject to this, it is not considered that the awnings themselves would inappropriately obstruct pedestrian movement or cause any other highway safety concerns.

Other Matters

5.10 A previous section of this report has noted that the scheme would harm the character and historic significance of the CA. Whilst this is noted, the localised nature of the impacts means that for the purposes of the NPPF the harm would be 'less than substantial'. In these circumstances, paragraph 202 of the NPPF outlines that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. No public benefits have been advanced by the applicant. It is noted that the provision of the awnings would allow the display of goods on the pavement during adverse weather conditions, however this is a benefit to the existing business, rather than a wider public benefit. There are no public benefits arising from the scheme, which would outweigh the harm to the character and historic significance of the CA.

5.11 It is acknowledged that the awnings would be retractable meaning that they could be pulled back when the business is not open. In addition, the awnings may be retracted when weather

allows this. Whilst these observations are noted, there is no enforceable condition, which could require the awnings to be retracted in particular weather conditions. Therefore, the awnings could in reality be extended throughout the day. Regardless of this, even if the awnings were only present during adverse weather conditions, there would nonetheless be visual harm at these times, which would detract from the character of the host building, the street scene and the CA. As such, the retractable form of the awnings would not justify the proposed scheme.

Conclusion

5.12 The proposal is considered unacceptable, as the awnings would appear as bulky, modern and dominant additions, which would fail to respect the historic character and architectural features of the host building. The awnings would appear alien in this locality and out of keeping in this part of the CA. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the CA. The historic significance of the CA would be adversely impacted, with the special interest of this heritage asset not preserved.

5.13 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

7. CIL APPLICABLE

N/A.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION.

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed awnings, by virtue of their size, scale, siting, design, form and materials, would appear as unsympathetic, dominant and bulky additions. The awnings would fail to respect the architectural features and historic character of the host building. In addition, the awnings would appear out of keeping and incongruous in the street scene and the Crouch End Conservation Area. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the Conservation Area. The historic significance of the Conservation Area would be harmed, with the special interest of this heritage asset not preserved. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D3 & HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 & SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1 & DM9 of the Development Management DPD (2017).