

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4528
Type	Full planning permission
Location	Public House, 492 West Green Road, Tottenham, London, N15 3DA
Proposal	Retrospective application for the conversion of the loft space including the erection of new mansard roof in order to provide an additional self-contained one-bedroom flat.
Case Officer	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date	23/12/2022
Applicant	Mr Joseph Kelly
Agent	Katarina McNabb

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This retrospective planning application is sought for the extension of the original building in the form of a mansard roof within the roof space to provide 1 new self-contained residential flat in addition to the existing 2 units on first and second floor level.

The proposed new residential unit comprises of a 1- bedroom, 2 person dwelling, a living/ dining and kitchen open plan living experience and bathroom.

It is important to note that the existing mansard roof has already been constructed without the benefit of planning permission and as such the unauthorised existing mansard is the subject of enforcement complaint.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a three-storey building with a mansard roof extension above which operates as a pub. It is located to corner of Willow Walk and West Green Road. The local area is primarily residential in character with commercial shops along West Green Road.

The application site is not located within conservation area, however, application building is locally listed.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows:

- HGY/2022/1857 REFUSED 09/08/2022 - Rear extension to existing mixed use building (Public house on the ground floor with residential use of the upper floors) and conversion of an existing loft space into a habitable mansard roof in order to provide a total of 5no. additional self-contained units.
- OLD/1983/1749 GTD 13/06/1983 Display of projecting illuminated rounded sign.
- OLD/1976/1451 GTD 15/06/1976 Display of one non-illuminated 4 sheet wall mounted advertisement panel.

There is Enforcement planning history in relation to the site.

- LBW/2021/00252 unauthorised erection of a mansard roof extension at a locally listed building dated 28/04/2021.

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

1) LBH Conservation Officer: no comments

2) LBH Transportation Team: The site has excellent public transport accessibility (PTAL=6a) and is located within a CPZ. No objection subject to the following:

- A legal agreement to secure a car free development.
- That the number and design of the proposed cycle parking spaces is revised to meet London Plan standards.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 14 letters. No representations have been received from neighbours and/or local groups, in response to notification and publicity of the application.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Design and appearance;
3. Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
4. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
5. Inclusive access;
6. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
7. Transport considerations;
8. Trees and landscaping;
9. Energy and sustainability and
10. Other considerations.

Principle of development

London Plan (2021) Policy H2A outlines a clear presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) and sets out a minimum target in Table 4.2 for boroughs (Haringey –10 year target is 2,600).

London Plan Policy D3 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity of existing and future transport services.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) promotes the effective use of land by anticipating the re-use of land that has been previously developed, provided that it is not of high environmental value. The site is considered to be previously developed land in form of pub on the ground floor with residential accommodation above.

The site is located within a primarily residential area on previously developed land. Policy SP2 - Maximising housing growth seeks to maximise the supply of additional homes in the borough to meet and exceed the annual housing target for Haringey as set out in the London Plan for the period 2015 to 2030. Policy DM50 seeks to resist the loss of a public house, unless it can be demonstrated that it is no longer financially viable. Therefore in principle the provision of additional residential units is supported subject to meeting other development plan policy requirements.

Design and Appearance

London Plan (2021) policies emphasise the importance of high-quality and seek to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach. Policy D4 'Delivering good design' states that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Local Plan Policy SP11 (2017) and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects local context and character to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to meet a range of criteria having regard to the following: building heights; form, scale and massing prevailing around the site; urban grain; sense of enclosure and where appropriate following existing building lines; rhythm of neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths; active, lively frontages to public realm; and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.

This section of West Green Road is at edge of commercial parade where buildings are of similar height and directly opposite and rear of the application site are residential street of predominantly two storey dwellings of individual design or arranged in small groups of similar character and appearance. Such as a group in the form of a short terrace with consistent design features. The host building include a front parapet, which obscures the flat roof, with chimney pots visible from the side street.

The proposal involves a raised mansard style roof extension to the existing roof. Due to the extent of the set-back from the front of the roof and the limited width of the street, it would not be possible to see the extension from immediately in front of the terrace, however approaching the terrace from the all directions, there is a highly open aspect to the sides of the adjacent properties and it is possible to see the full extent of the roof with the chimney pots above the adjoining terraces.

From this view, the unaltered and consistent appearance of the roofscape is readily apparent. The open, undeveloped roof contributes to the character and appearance of the group and to the quality of the street scene. The addition of development in the form of a raised roof to the public house has upset its existing uniformity and consistent appearance. Despite the majority of buildings in this part of West Green Road being different, most appear to be unaltered and have retained their original built form. In this setting the roof extension is prominent and incongruous change which would be harmful to the character and appearance of the terrace and street scene.

To the rear, the extended roof would be more prominent in this setting and would be visible from many views from surrounding gardens. As such, it would cause material harm from this perspective. The proposed development, on account of its detailed design and height proportions would result in a development of poor overall design quality that fails to respond sensitively to site constraints or its wider context.

The proposal would represent a development out of scale with its context and therefore conclude that it would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, conflicting with the aims and requirements of Policy BD1 and Policy SP3 of the Council's Core Strategy and also the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The overall quality of the mansard is poor. The proportions on the upper floors give it a squat appearance, particularly its height and the awkward angle of the mansard in relation to the original roof form. The proportions of the roof top storey which is taller than the floor storey below, gives the building a top heavy and bulky appearance. The east and rear elevation demonstrates a lack of clear design intent which is reflected in the lack of consistency in material application. The predominantly blank east and rear elevations offers little visual interest when viewed from rear of the site.

For the reasons given, it is considered the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the terrace of which it is a part and the street scene. Consequently, it is contrary to the following policies of the Council's Local Plan and DPD, concerning the safeguarding and enhancement of the character of the urban environment; DM1 which, amongst other matters, requires new development in urban areas to not result in unsympathetic change; and DM12, which requires residential extensions to complement the street scene. These policies are broadly consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly section seven concerning good design.

Impact on the character and appearance of the locally listed building

London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

The building is locally listed local landmark bearing architectural interest, historic interest, townscape interest, rarity in the local area and relative integrity, Local Planning Authority would consider that building significant by virtue of its designed aesthetic value and historic value as part of the surviving townscape and character of the area.

The additional floor and the bulky, uncharacteristic mansard roof extension would obscure the original proportions, architectural composition and roof form of the host building. The extension would unacceptably overwhelm the host building and would dominate in views of The Green Gate

Public House from the Common, from both sides of West Green Road and southward views along Willow Walk. While the existing pub is fully legible as an historic building representative of the Victorian pub and townscape that preceded and somewhat still surround it, the proposed alterations would very insensitively bulk up the locally listed building and would delete any experience of the original built scale, traditional roofscape and spatial relationship between buildings and landscape which contributes to the distinctive urban character of this part of the borough.

The proposed additional floor and the mansard roof would have a severely negative impact on the special interest of the host building and would substantially harm its significance as heritage asset.

Any harm to heritage asset is undesirable in principle, especially when it substantially erodes the special interest, attached value and significance of heritage assets, even more when this harm is not convincingly and comprehensively justified and only delivers private benefits. Both the proposed top floor and mansard roof extension are not supported in principle from conservation grounds

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

London Plan Policy D6 requires housing developments to be of high quality design, providing comfortable and functional layouts, benefiting from sufficient daylight and sunlight, maximising the provision of dual aspect units and providing adequate and easily accessible storage space as well as outdoor amenity space. Table 3.1 sets out the internal minimum space standards for new developments, while Table 3.2 of the London Plan provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments.

The proposed flat within the development is over or comply with the minimum floorspace requirements under London Plan as illustrated in the table below.

Unit Required Provision Amenity (sq. m)

Mansard flat (1b 2p) 50sq.m 55.4sq.m 7.7sq.m (Roof Terrace)

Amenity space (private)

The London Plan Housing SPG states that a minimum of 5m² of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1m² should be provided for each additional occupant. The mansard flat (1 bedroom dwelling) with private outdoor amenity space of 7.7sqm, which would comply with the London Plan Housing SPG standard.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

Although, the proposal introduces a large extension within the roof scape. Given the distance between the application site and the properties on the other side of West Green Road and those to the rear of Willow Walk, it is not considered that the proposal will cause a significant loss of daylight and sunlight or increased sense of enclosure to those properties.

Transport Considerations

London Plan Policy T1 requires all development to make the most effective use of land, reflecting its connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking and cycling routes, and to ensure that any impacts on London's transport networks and supporting infrastructure are mitigated. Policies T4, T5 and T6 set out key principles for the assessment of development impacts on the highway network in terms of trip generation, parking demand and cycling provision.

Local Plan 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 DPD Policy DM31 'Sustainable Transport'.

DPD Policy DM32 'Parking' states that the Council will support proposals for new development with limited or no on-site parking where there are alternative and accessible means of transport available, public transport accessibility is at least 4 as defined in the Public Transport Accessibility Index, a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) exists or will be provided prior to the occupation of the development, parking is provided for disabled people; and parking is designated for occupiers of developments specified as 'car capped'.

This development proposal is for 1 new flat to add to the existing flats at this site, and it is proposed this will be car free/permit free. This is acceptable in principle given the excellent PTAL of 6A and the proximity to local shops and services.

Servicing and Refuse Storage

Waste at this location is collected weekly. The development would therefore be required to accommodate a week's worth of waste for both the residential development as well as the ground floor commercial unit. The proposed bins are located at the rear of the development.

No information has been provide on servicing arrangements for the proposed commercial unit. However, given the scale of development, it is likely that this could have been addressed by condition.

Conclusion

The proposed mansard roof extension by reason of its design, size, scale, and siting would be an incongruous and unsympathetic feature that would harm the character and appearance of the terrace and wider conservation area. The extension would result in an undesirable visual feature when observed from the side and rear and would be harmful to the appearance of the locally listed building. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 in the Council's Development Management Document (2017) and Policies SP11 and SP12 of adopted Haringey's Local Plan 2013 and Policies D4 and HC1 of the adopted London Plan (2021).

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

CIL APPLICABLE

The development is less than 100 square metres but is for a whole new unit and as such is liable for CIL. Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £3,330.25 (55sqm x £60.55) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £1,225.40 (55sqm x £22.28 (Indexation included)). 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.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed mansard roof extension by reason of its design, size, scale, and siting would be an incongruous and unsympathetic feature that would harm the character and appearance of the terrace and wider conservation area. The extension would result in an undesirable visual feature when observed from the side and rear and would be harmful to the appearance of the locally listed building. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 in the Council's Development Management Document (2017), Policies SP11 and SP12 of adopted Haringey's Local Plan (2017), Policies D4 and HC1 of the adopted London Plan (2021) and the NPPF.