

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4502
Type	Full planning permission
Location	10A Broadway Parade, Tottenham Lane, Hornsey, London, N8 9DE
Proposal	Installation of 1 no. new gas riser to the front elevation
Case Officer	Laina Levassor
Valid Date	21/12/2022
Applicant	c/o Agent
Agent	Other - EP Team

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

SITE DESCRIPTION

This application relates to a 3 storey building sited on the south-eastern side of Broadway Parade formed of a mixed use site with commercial use at ground floor and residential above. The site falls within the Crouch End Conservation Area, within which the host terrace is considered to make a positive contribution to.

PROPOSAL

This application proposes the installation of a gas riser to the front elevation of the building.

ANALYSIS/ASSESSMENT

Consultation Response - Historic Buildings & Conservation:

In statutory terms the significance of the heritage asset has been recognised by its designation as a conservation area, which reflects its 'special interest'. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA Act 1990) states that Local Planning Authorities have a statutory duty to ensure that 'special attention shall be paid to desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.'

Furthermore, Paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states: When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance.

The Site is a nineteenth-century century mid-terrace building set within the wider terrace along Broadway Parade built by local builder and developer, John Cathles Hill. Whilst the ground-floor shopfront has been insensitively altered at ground-floor level, it does retain some important traditional features such as the decorative pilasters, capitals, and consoles. It is also noted that rainwater goods, cabling and conduits, cameras and lighting, and pipework to the principal façade has resulted in a detracting visual clutter which is mirrored by other buildings within the street scene.

The proposed location and route of the gas riser has clearly been carefully considered to respect the architectural features of the Site. Equally, the proposals generally adhere to the core conservation principle of reversibility.

However, the addition of the proposed gas riser to the principal elevation would add to the visual clutter of the Site, detract from the surviving traditional features, and fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Crouch End, contrary to Paragraph 206 of the NPPF. As such, the proposals would lead to less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset, making Paragraph 202 of the NPPF relevant. Planning Policy Guidance states that when a category of harm is identified, the extent of harm should be clearly articulated (Paragraph 018 Reference ID: 18a-018-20190723). It is considered that the proposals would lead to low levels of less than substantial harm. It is not possible to support the proposals as they are in conflict with Paragraphs 199, 202, and 206 of the NPPF and Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

In response to the above comments, the applicant provided additional information in order to justify why the proposal is compliant with Paragraph 200 of the NPPF:

Certainly, the agent has made a sound argument for the proposals, justifying why the identified harm cannot be mitigated – this is in compliance with paragraph 200 of the NPPF which requires a clear and convincing justification for any harm to a heritage asset.

In my view, the proposals do result in low levels of less than substantial harm to the heritage asset. As such, Paragraph 202 is engaged and the low levels of harm should be weighed against the public benefits, if any, of the proposals.

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF

Paragraph 202 of the NPPF states: “202. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use”.

Consideration therefore is weighed against the public benefits to enable the provision of gas to a residential unit and the less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset.

The applicant recognises within the provided Design & Access statement that any such proposal should be undertaken giving sensitivity to the host building and seeks to minimise harmful impacts to the building itself through:

‘Ensuring holes for the riser are drilled between the brick joints rather than the bricks themselves; Painting the pipework an appropriate colour in order to limit the visual impact of the pipework. For example, where the pipe will be fixed to painted surfaces, the pipework should match this (i.e. white) and where it will be fixed to exposed brick, the pipework can be painted black; Undertake appropriate reinstatement of the working area as previous following completion of the works; and, producing a photographic record of condition before and after the works to cover liability’

It is considered that the proposal results in low levels of less than substantial harm to the heritage asset. As such, Paragraph 202 is engaged and the low levels of harm should be weighed against the public benefits, if any, of the proposals.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that this application demonstrates an example of where under Paragraph 202 of the NPPF, the public benefits of the proposal justifies the carrying out of development which causes less than substantial harm to a heritage asset, as such planning permission should be granted.

Conditions:

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the approved plans and drawings listed in this decision notice, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.