

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2023/0003
Type	Full planning permission
Location	Christ Apostolic Church, High Road, Tottenham, London, N15 4BN
Proposal	Perimeter security railings, gates and vehicle crossovers to the road facing areas
Case Officer	Sabelle Adjagboni
Valid Date	02/01/2023
Applicant	Pastor Emanuel Tukasi
Agent	Mr Peter French

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

Reasons for Refusal:

1. The proposal by reason of its inadequate design and materials, as well its overbearing scale, is considered to be out of keeping and would detract from the character and appearance of the host building and wider THRHC/Seven Sisters/Page Green the conservation areas, contrary to policies, DM1, DM3, DM9, SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.
2. The proposed installation of two vehicular crossovers, due to the lack of justification or technical consideration of their impact, would introduce additional points for potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, and adversely impact on highway safety. Furthermore, the loss of CPZ permit parking, due to the impact this would have, to on-street parking, is not supported. The proposals would therefore be contrary to policy DM32 and DM33.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

This is an application for perimeter security railings, gates and vehicle crossovers to the road facing areas.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a church at the intersection of Page Green Terrace and Pembroke Road. It is in the THRHC, Seven Sisters, and Page Green conservation areas. It is also a locally listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

HGY/2022/2762 | Perimeter security fencing, gates and vehicle crossovers to the road facing areas | Refused.

Consultation response

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

Objection from the London Borough Haringey Transport Planning Team

Transport comments are as follows:

- a. There is no justification for the proposed provision of two vehicular crossovers. The introduction of vehicular crossovers would introduce additional points for potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, and adversely impact on highway safety. This would be contrary to Policy DM33.
- b. There are no details regarding existing or proposed car parking on site. The application form indicates there is no existing or proposed car parking. Clarification is required regarding why the vehicular crossovers are required.
- c. The loss of CPZ permit parking is also not supported and would be contrary to Policy DM33.

The proposals are not supported for the transport reasons outlined above.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and 43 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:

Objecting: 0

Supporting: 1

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:

- Negative impact of proposed vehicle crossovers on pedestrians and vehicles.
- Lack of details regarding car parking.
- Loss of CPZ permit parking.

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; and
4. Transport 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 principal of providing some type of security to protect the architectural value of the building is acceptable, subject to all relevant planning considerations, namely the impact on the conservation area and highway implications.

As such the proposal is in line with the above policies.

Design and appearance

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

The proposed fence is 1.8m high, which is an improvement from the previous proposal; and will be black wrought iron in material. It is made of vertical lines with pointed edges at the top. It includes two gates, one single and one double of 0.9m x 1.8m and 3m x 1.8m respectively. Although the design proposed is an improvement from the last proposal, the proposed gate is still considered to be dense, inadequately design and remains overbearing for the host building.

Therefore, the proposed fence by reason of its design is inappropriate, overbearing and will have a negative impact on visual appearance and architectural significance of the building and detract from the design character of the wider conservation area.

As such the proposal is at odds with the above policies.

Impact on the 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 fencing would run right across the Page Green Terrace boundary and round onto Pembroke Road. It is 1.8m high, in black wrought iron railings. Although less dense in scale than in the previous proposal, the current one would still obscure the lower half of the ground floor elevations,

thereby obscuring the visibility of the building, detracting from the architectural significance which the conservation area is trying preserve. The fencing seems inappropriate for the conservation area setting and fails to compliment the architecture of the historic building.

Therefore, the scheme does not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

As such the proposal is at odds with the above policies.

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'.

The transport team of the council was consulted on the application and object to the proposal. The proposal raises the risk of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians due to the introduction of vehicular crossovers which has not been properly justified. Additionally, the loss of CPZ permit parking is not supported and is contrary to policy DM33.

As such, the proposal in line with the above policies.

Conclusion

In conclusion, although the principle of protecting the building is acceptable, however the proposal cannot be supported by reason of its inadequate design, scale and given the impact on the Haringey highways network, cannot be supported in transport terms. Therefore, the proposal is not acceptable.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been considered. 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 proposal by reason of its inadequate design and materials, as well its overbearing scale, is considered to be out of keeping and would detract from the character and appearance of the host building and wider THRHC/Seven Sisters/Page Green the conservation areas, contrary to policies, DM1, DM3, DM9, SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

The proposed installation of two vehicular crossovers, due to the lack of justification or technical consideration of their impact, would introduce additional points for potential conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, and adversely impact on highway safety. Furthermore, the loss of CPZ permit parking, due to the impact this would have, to on-street parking, is not supported. The proposals would therefore be contrary to policy DM32 and DM33.