

OCC, Building
A, 105 Eade
Road, London
N4 1TJ

Email: info@eadeplanning.com
Office: 020 8150 1820
Mobile: 07815 794 958

Planning & Heritage Statement

For the
Erection of a two-storey building providing a three-bedroom
house.

At
Rear of 89 Philip Lane, Tottenham, London N15 4JR

By Shulem Posen
Eade Planning Ltd

Date
July 2023

Contents

The Site	2
Planning History and Background	3
The Proposal	4
Conclusion	4
Heritage Statement	5
Policy relating to Heritage Assets.	5



The Site

1. The site sits on the land behind No. 89 Philip Lane, a semi-detached property currently split into several apartments. The property is surrounded by private dwelling houses and other terraced houses.
2. To the west it is bordered by the garden to No 87 Philip Lane, to the east it faces Jansons Road. To the south it is bordered by the garden to No. 27 Jansons Road.
3. The site is located within the Clyde Circus Conservation Area.

Planning History and Background

4. This application follows a number of planning applications for development at the above site all of which were refused. This application seeks planning permission for a reduced scheme. The Applicant considers that the revised scheme addresses all previous reasons for refusal.
5. The delegated report of the most recent refusal (HGY/2020/3185) states that the principle of residential development is considered acceptable at this location, given the existing residential use. However, the acceptability of any such proposal to sub-divide the existing plot will be based upon the design of the scheme meeting the provisions of Council's DPD (2017) policies and adopted London Plan (2016).
6. However, the report concludes,
a development of the scale proposed is not considered acceptable on this site. Nevertheless, given the depth of the site and it's relationship with Jansons Road, a small, discreet development which responds to the character and appearance of the conservation area as well as accepting the narrow width and constraints of the site could be considered acceptable.
7. DM Policy DM7 relates to infill and garden sites and states that: There will be a presumption against the loss of garden land unless it represents comprehensive redevelopment of a number of whole land plots. Development proposals for infill, backland and garden land should:
a Relate appropriately and sensitively to the surrounding area as well as the established street scene, ensuring good access and where possible, retaining existing through routes;
b Provide a site specific and creative response to the built and natural features of the area;
c Where appropriate, repair or re-provide street frontages and provide additional passive surveillance and increased security;
d Safeguard privacy, amenity, and ensure no loss of security for adjoining houses and rear gardens;
e Retain and provide adequate amenity space for existing and new occupants;
f Incorporate at least one street frontage or be ancillary to the host dwelling and the adjacent houses/terraces;

The Proposal

8. This proposal has been reduced to propose only one modest two storey single family dwellinghouse. In fact, the proposal is to duplicate the existing house at No.27 Jansons Road.
9. The property will be a three-bedroom 5 person dwellinghouse and will sit within its own site with its own garden.

Conclusion

10. The proposal will provide for an additional three-bedroom dwellinghouse in London for which there is an identified need. The proposal will not have any detrimental effect on the area. The LPA are therefore, respectfully asked to grant planning permission for the proposal.

Heritage Statement

Policy relating to Heritage Assets.

1. National Planning Policy Framework - February 2019

Section 16 - **Conserving and enhancing the historic environment**, stresses the importance of preserving or enhancing historic environment.

189. In determining applications, local planning authorities should require an applicant to describe the significance of any heritage assets affected, including any contribution made by their setting. The level of detail should be proportionate to the assets' importance and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on their significance.

192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of:

- a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation;*
- b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and*
- c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.*

Considering potential impacts

193. 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.

194. Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of:

- a) grade II listed buildings, or grade II registered parks or gardens, should be exceptional;*
- b) assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, registered battlefields, grade I and II* listed buildings, grade I and II* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional.*

195. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and*
- b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and*
- c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

196. 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.

197. The effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that directly or indirectly affect non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Designated heritage asset: *A World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument, Listed Building, Protected Wreck Site, Registered Park and*

Garden, Registered Battlefield or Conservation Area designated under the relevant legislation.

The application site is identified and is recognized as holding a degree of significance related to its status as a contributor to the conservation area. Distinctive features which have been identified in the area include decorative mouldings, plaster heads, bay window and door surrounds as well as the ample front garden space. Buildings in this part of the conservation area have been moderately adapted and extended through small-scale rear extensions.

The changes that are proposed are in one main area; the rear garden fronting Jansons Road.

The proposed dwellinghouse is noticeably set back from the main building. As such there is not disturbance on the historic character of the building.

The addition will cause no such impacts on the appearance of the street scene and is likely to be a harmonious addition to the street matching its neighbour.

It is considered the proposal will not detract or cause harm to the original architecture as a heritage asset.

There is a degree of enhancement to the site as it is currently derelict and it is therefore concluded that the proposal meets local policy and NPPF requirements and the statutory duty in section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.