



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/0543
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Archives, Unit 10 High Cross Centre, Fountayne Road, London N15 4BE
Proposal:	Change of panel to fixed glass windows
Case Officer:	Oskar Gregersen
Valid Date:	22/02/2023
Applicant:	Mr David Reiss
Agent:	Mr Sumade De Silva

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

This is an application for the replacement of existing coloured glazing separating two banks of windows with additional glazing to facilitate a significantly larger window in a commercial space.

Site and Surroundings

1.1 The application site is a tall mixed commercial building set within the High Cross Centre, the building was constructed in the late 20th Century and is characterised by alternating bands of brick, then glazing, the coloured cladding followed by additional glazing. This appearance is consistent throughout the building and forms an integral part of its character.

1.2 The surrounding area to the east is the outdoor grounds of a local school, and the eastern side of the site abuts the railway. To the west the area is almost wholly industrial, with some residential streets further afield.

1.3 The site is not located within any conservation area, nor is it locally listed.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

1.4.1 HGY/2020/1386 | Temporary change of use (for a period of seven years only) of 9,100sqm of Use Class B2/B8 floorspace to a mix of uses including flexible office, making and studio space, gym or similar sport/leisure space and a cafe (all Use Class E), and flexible event/exhibition space

(sui generis), together with external alterations to ground floor to create new entrance to and reception area for the building, landscaping, provision of wheelchair accessible parking and electric charging points, cycle parking and refuse storage.

Approve w/ Conditions

1.4.2 HGY/2021/3056 | Temporary change of use of 1,216sqm of Use Class B2/B8 floorspace at ground floor to flexible event/exhibition space (sui generis), creation of a new rooftop cafe/bar (sui generis) including installation of landscaping, associated structures and a glazed safety screen, extension of existing lift cores to provide access to the roof, re-landscaping of the ground floor forecourt and provision of additional cycle parking.

Approve w/ Conditions

1.4.3 HGY/2021/3108 | Variation of condition 2 (approved plans) of permission HGY/2020/1386 to enable the range of permitted uses in respect of floor 5 of the High Cross Centre to be extended to include Class E work, maker and studio space

Under Consultation

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

2.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

- No responses

External:

- No responses

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way 3 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: 0

Objecting: 0

Supporting: 0

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Design and appearance;
2. Impact on neighbouring amenity;

Design and appearance

4.2 Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 states that all new development should enhance and enrich the build environment of Haringey, and create buildings that are high quality, attractive, safe, and

sustainable to use. Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management DPD continues this approach and requires development proposal to respond positively to their locality.

4.3 The application is for the alteration of an existing band of cladding between two banks of windows at the top floor on the north-eastern most corner of the site. Currently the site, and building as a whole is characterised by a repeating pattern of brick and cladding in concentric bands from ground to sixth floor level. The proposal would see a break in this pattern with the coloured cladding removed and replaced with glazing.

4.4 The concentric bands of brick, then glazing, cladding, glazing and then brick, are seen to be an intentional feature of the building as designed. Officers deem that any interruption in this pattern would be detrimental to the character of the building as designed. If the cladding were replaced in its entirety, then the appearance would not be so greatly affected. However, this proposal seeks the replacement of the cladding in only one location, and therefore the change is seen to be a degradation to the character of the host building contrary to policy.

4.5 Officers note that whilst the renewed use of Unit 10, High Cross Centre has been welcomed through prior permissions (Ref: HGY/2020/1386) along with improvements to the existing façade, the proposed alterations to the originally intended of the aesthetic of the exterior of the building would introduce a feature that would appear at odds with the rest of the host building. This alteration could potentially lead to an overall degradation of the exterior of the building as individual units within the building changed from cladding to glazing, potentially creating a hotchpotch appearance.

4.6 Overall, the reasoning given for the alterations to the cladding, and replacement with glazing is to improve the existing commercial space. The LPA acknowledge and welcome the need to improve office space in aging buildings, however in this instance it is deemed that, on balance, the harm done to the character of the building is not outweighed by any potential improvement brought to the commercial space. The LPA would support a more sympathetic approach to the replacement of the unit's glazing, that reprovided the cladding that matched the rest of the building.

4.7 As such, Officers deem that the replacement of coloured cladding with glazing is contrary to Local Plan Policy SP11, and DPD Policy DM1 as it does not respect the character of the host building, introducing an incongruous feature that is contrary to the original design and the proposal should be refused.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

4.8 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.

4.9 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 residents.

4.10 The proposal is not deemed to have any impact on neighbouring amenity, as the replacement glazing would be at sixth floor level and would face toward railway lines and school playing fields. The proposal would be acceptable in amenity terms.

Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered not acceptable as it would introduce a feature incongruous to the character of the host building, and would appear at odds with the rest of the building, contrary to Local Plan Policy SP11 and DPD Policy D6.

5.2 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted/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 alterations to the elevation of the building would appear an incongruous feature not in keeping with the host building and harmful to the character of the area, contrary to DPD Policy DM1 and Local Plan Policy SP11.