

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0518
Type	Full planning permission
Location	143-145 Philip Lane, Tottenham, London, N15 4HQ
Proposal	Retractable canopy to shopfront (Retrospective)
Case Officer	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date	21/02/2023
Applicant	Expa Superstores Ltd
Agent	Ms Tuba Korkmaz

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This is a retrospective planning application for the construction of front extension in a form of retractable aluminium posts frame with lightweight polycarbonate sheeting on top. This replaces existing permanent canopy to the front of the premises, which serves the ground floor retail premises for the display of fruit and vegetables.

Site and Surroundings

The former Botany Bay Public House, 143 & 145 Philip Lane, is located within the Clyde Circus Conservation Area and is identified within the Adopted Conservation Area Appraisal as a building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the streetscape. The ground floor element is in retail use with residential accommodation above. Downhills Park is located to the west of the property and Lordship recreation ground to the east. Seven Sisters, London Underground Station is located to the south-east.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- HGY/2019/2299 - REF - 30-09-19 Proposed single storey shop front extension.
- HGY/2019/2298 - REF - 30-09-19 Proposed single storey shop front extension.
- HGY/2014/3395 - GTD-04-05-16 - Demolition of front extension and front security shutter, and installation of replacement shopfront, security shutter and folding canopy
- HGY/2012/0627 - GTD - 07-08-12 - 143-145 Philip Lane London - Conversion of first and second floors into 1 x 3 bed, 1 x 2 and 3 x 1 self-contained flats
- HGY/2012/0193 - REF - 13-03-12 - 143-145 Philip Lane London - Display of 3 x internally illuminated fascia signs

- HGY/2012/0192 - REF - 13-03-12 - 143-145 Philip Lane London - Demolition of front extension and installation of folding canopy and security shutters
- HGY/2008/1554 - REF - 16-09-08 - 143-145 Philip Lane London - Display of 3 x internally illuminated signs
- HGY/2008/1553 - REF - 16-09-08 - 143 - 145 Philip Lane London - Installation of new shop front
- HGY/2007/1799 - GTD - 16-10-07 - Botany Bay Public House, 143-145 Philip Lane London - Erection of single storey rear extension at ground floor and basement level.
- HGY/2007/0652 - PERM DEV - 10-07-07 - 143 - 145 Philip Lane Tottenham London - Change of use from a Public House (ground floor & basement) to a retail (A1).
- HGY/2001/0648 - GTD - 26-06-01 - 143 Philip Lane London - Display of externally illuminated static sign.

CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The following were consulted regarding the application:

The following responses were received:

Internal:

1) LBH Conservation Officer: Objects to the proposal on the following grounds the proposal would detract from the historic character of the façade.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 1 site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 76 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 0

Objecting: 0

Supporting: 0

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

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

Character and appearance of the conservation area

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 application building is a former large brick public house in an eye-catching location at a main street corner within the Clyde Conservation Area. This attractive three-storey building has frontages on two main streets with ornate stucco detailing at first and second floors. This includes a heavy eaves cornice, a corner spire turret, urn-topped pilasters and pedimented dormer details that are continuous with the parapet. It is one of the more attractive and characterful ones in the immediate vicinity and as such this historic building, whilst not listed, contributes substantially to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

From the outside at street level, it is in use as green grocery shop, and along Philip Lane, has been extended onto the front boundary in line with neighbouring residential garden walls. There is a fixed open –fronted lean-to roof supported on steel posts. The flat roof is finished with lightweight polycarbonate sheeting, including galvanised steel in between the posts and are opened on all sides.

The proposed solid canopy extends across the front of the premises. It also projects a significant distance outwards from the front elevation. Therefore, the canopy is of a substantial size. Owing to the use of the size and flat roof detail, the canopy has a rather squat profile. Additionally, the canopy has been constructed of utilitarian external materials, consisting of aluminium frame with clear polycarbonate sheeting on the roof. None of the above factors pay any meaningful regards to the architectural forms and external materials typical of traditional buildings in the surrounding area, significantly obscuring the view of the historic frontage. While the forecourt is bounded by a front boundary wall on one side, this is not in line with the host buildings, jutting out and obscuring the frontage, as such, taking all of the above factors into account, the canopy fails to integrate satisfactorily with host building or surrounding development and it appears as an awkward, obvious and alien addition to the premises in the street scene. Consequently, the canopy causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal would interrupt the original vertical rhythm of the building and add to the accumulation of clutter to the building, which detract from its historic frontage. Although an attempt to replicate some of the historic façade details on the extension, but there is very little detail in the application materials, and nothing to suggest this would be done carefully or with attention to materials, details and craftsmanship. The proposal would badly detract from the character of the original building by projecting forward of the original building line an obscuring the composition and architectural details of the original.

The canopy fails to accord with Policies DM1 and DM9 of the adopted UPD, as its siting, character and appearance does not respect the site and its surroundings and it is detrimental to the built environment and the character of this part of the Borough. The canopy is also inconsistent with the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) at section 12 concerning achieving well designed places, as it is not visually attractive, it does not maintain a strong sense of place and it fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area.

Conclusions

The proposed front extension enclosure of the forecourt of the shop by reason its form, size, design and siting would relate poorly to the original building and would appear as a visually obtrusive and unattractive addition to the street scene in a prominent location, to the detriment of local visual amenity and would fail to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1 and DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017.and Policy HC1 of the 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 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.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed front extension enclosure of the forecourt of the shop by reason its form, size, design and siting would relate poorly to the original building and would appear as a visually obtrusive and unattractive addition to the street scene in a prominent location, to the detriment of local visual amenity and would fail to enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1 and DM9 of The Development Management DPD 2017.and Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021.