

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4188
Type	Full planning permission
Location	373 Archway Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4EJ
Proposal	Replacement of existing shop front
Case Officer	Tania Skelli
Valid Date	12/12/2022
Applicant	Mr Harpal Bhohi
Agent	Mr Jeff Gillett

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. APPLICATION DETAILS

Drawing number of plans: Site location plan, 11/2577/201, 202/D, 203/B, 204/E, 205/C, Design and access statement dated 7/1/2022, Heritage Statement dated 7/1/23.

Proposal: Replacement of existing shop front

2. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1) The proposed shopfront alterations by virtue of design, arrangement and materiality would be detrimental to the original building design and would detract from the parade as a whole and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the existing pair of buildings. As such it would be harmful to the Highgate Conservation Area and contrary to Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP0, SP11, SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1, DM8 and DM9 of Haringey's Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017.

3. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

3.1 This is an application for the replacement (re-instatement) of the existing shopfront and residential entrance door.

Site and Surroundings

3.2 The application site is a shopfront set within the historic local shopping parade of the Archway Road, which forms part of the Highgate Conservation Area. The shopfront lies on the street frontage of this pair of historic pair of Georgian Villa. A side door leads to the residential accommodation above.

4. PLANNING HISTORY

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

HGY/2022/1335 - Retention of existing shop front (retrospective application). Refused.

HGY/2005/2155 - Installation of new shopfront. Refused.

Adjoining sites:

HGY/2021/3503 - 20 Crescent Road - Alterations to the shop front including new glazing and relocating the entrance door. Refused and dismissed on appeal ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3291928 on 6th June 2022.

HGY/2021/2153 - 84 Fortis Green Road - Installation of new shopfront, realignment entrance and front awning. Refused and dismissed on appeal ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3288071 on 28th April 2022.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

5.1 The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and letters to adjoining occupiers. The number of representations received from neighbours and local groups in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 0

5.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Highgate CAAC.

5.3 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Materials harmful to CA
- Design harmful to the CA
- Original architectural details should be repaired, preserved, restored and reinstated
- Recessed entrance should be maintained
- Local harmful examples should not justify further harm
- Contrary to policy DH2 of HNP
- Contrary to policy DM8
- Insufficient supporting information in heritage statement and design and access statement to support proposal in conservation area

6 MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
2. Inclusive access; and
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.

Principle of development

6.2 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.

6.3 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.

6.4 DPD Policy DM8 specifically refers to shopfronts and signage and states that the Council will seek the retention of traditional shopfronts of distinctive character contributing to the visual, architectural or historic quality of the local townscape. As well as stating that replacement shopfronts should conserve original materials as far as possible.

6.5 The installed shopfront is fully glazed with powder coated aluminium frames. A stallriser and glazing sub-division are not included. The Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH2 states that 'original windows and doors are integral to Highgate's special character and should be retained and repaired wherever possible. Replacements should match the originals in terms of design and detail'. Whilst some architectural elements of the original shopfront may have been lost, the previously existing shopfront retained some traditional glazing sub-division as well as doors of traditional appearance. In addition, the policies are clear that original and lost architectural detailing should be repaired and restored.

6.6 Some of the proposed revisions within the application propose the recessed residential entrance door and move of the roller shutters to an internal location (with the annotation 'to be used in emergency'), however, overall, the proposed elevation drawings do not provide any clarity about the dimensions, proportions, details, and materials of the proposed shopfront whose windows design is described as 'to be confirmed' and no ornamental timber transoms and mullions is proposed for reinstatement.

6.7 In case of reinstatement of an existing shopfront, the proposal needs to be sufficiently detailed upfront, at consent stage, to ensure the replica matches the lost shopfront. The application is instead very vague and inaccurate and does not provide a sufficient level of information to assess its impact and cannot be supported from the heritage conservation perspective.

6.8 As such, the extent of works are considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and pair of buildings and would fail to preserve and enhance this special character.

Inclusive access

6.9 This would have a level access and would have a wide enough entrance for accessibility purposes. As such this is considered acceptable in this regard.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

6.10 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.

6.11 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.

6.12 The alterations would not have a significant impact on amenity to neighbours or existing occupiers.

Conclusion

6.13 Overall the extent of works are considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and parade, as positive contributors to the conservation area, which would fail to preserve and enhance this special character.

6.14 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

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sq.m. and therefore the proposal is not liable for the Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed shopfront alterations by virtue of design, arrangement and materiality would be detrimental to the original building design and would detract from the parade as a whole and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the existing pair of buildings. As such it would be harmful to the Highgate Conservation Area and contrary to Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP0, SP11, SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1, DM8 and DM9 of Haringey's Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017.