



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1102
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Storage Depot Railway Arch, 24 Moorefield Road, Tottenham, London, N17 6PX
Proposal:	Demolition of an existing warehouse building and the erection of a new larger warehouse in its place ancillary to the continuing use of the site as a builders merchant.
Case Officer:	Zara Seelig
Valid Date:	31/05/2023
Applicant:	Mr Ali Mentesh
Agent:	Mr Daniel Bedocs

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

Site Description

The site consists of a warehouse and outside storage, the site is situated on the Eastern side of Moorefield Road. The site is located within the THRHC/Bruce Grove Conservation Area, it is not a listed building. The site to the east borders the railway line and Bruce Grove train station.

Description of Development

The business comprised of 2 sites both located on Moorefield Road, the main site to which this planning proposal applies consists of trade counter, warehousing, outside storage and internal storage. This proposal is to demolish an existing dilapidated warehouse building and to erect a modern steel framed warehouse in its place, extending the building to cover the outside storage space to improve aesthetics, security and safety. The steel portal frame is to be erected within the site and to be clad in insulated steel cladding with two roller shutter doors and a double steel PA security door. All materials used are non combustible. The frame is prefabricated offsite to ensure the build process is extremely fast and will minimise any disruption. No wet trades are required for the building. The site is already used for B1, B2 and B8 class and the new building will retain these classes.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

Appears there is no history.

Consultation Response

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

LBH Transportation: Consulted – Comments are set out in the transportation section of the report below.

LBH Carbon Management: Consulted – No response received

LBH Conservation Officer: Consulted – Objection:

The built heritage officer has raised concerns that are set out in the design section of the report below.

External:

TFL: Consulted, no response received

Local Representations

The application has been publicised by way of a site notice and 11 neighbour consultation letters.

No responses received,

Material Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development
2. Design and appearance and Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity.
4. Transportation Impacts

Principle of Development

The proposal to replace an existing warehouse building with a new warehouse building with the use classes on the site being retained would be considered acceptable in principle.

Design and Appearance and Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area

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.

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 Councils Conservation officer commented as follows:

The site lies within the Bruce Grove Conservation Area, adjacent to the Bruce Grove Overground Station, former Post Office Depot and the former station master's house, which are all locally listed buildings. The buildings on the south end to the west side of Bruce Grove are grade II listed, apart from 1-2 Moorfield Road which is considered to positively contribute to the character of the Conservation Area. The design and detailing to the former Post Office Depot allow the building to remain a prominent addition to Moorefield Road, The position of the station masters house, at the corner of the curve in Moorefield Road allows it to be a prominent feature despite its relatively diminutive size. The large brickwork wall and remaining visible railway arches of the Bruce Grove Station are important and dominant features within this part of the Conservation Area.

The opening of the Great Eastern Railway line in 1872 promoted the growth of industry in the area and the commercialisation of the highroad. To the west of the railway line, the surviving Georgian townscape and commercialisation of Bruce Grove in the C19 and inter-war development defines the streetscene's character and contributes to the significance of the Conservation Area as a notable example of an essentially late-Victorian commercial townscape when the area rapidly urbanised.

The site lies on part of the former Post Office Depot site and lies in a tight site and is utilitarian in nature. The single storey building, and boundary walls are brightly painted and crudely topped in razor wire and are not visually attractive. In its current form the site is not considered to contribute to the significance of the Conservation Area, or to the setting of the other nearby heritage assets. The low form of the building and yard and remaining visibility of the Victorian railway wall and arches are the sites redeeming qualities. There is an opportunity to tidy up the site and the existing building which is of low quality, particularly in light of the wider background of heritage led regeneration which is taking place in the immediate surrounding area.

There is no heritage statement submitted with the application contrary to paragraph 194 of the NPPF and local plan policy DM9(b).

The proposed new building is located on the south of the site and is a steel-clad building presenting two blank facades to Moorefield Road and the south boundary of the site. The location of the proposed building would result in obscuring the last remaining visible railway arches along Moorefield Road.

The proposed building is considerably taller than the adjacent units and would present its full height directly on the boundary to the public highway. Additionally, the proposed steel cladding is an incongruous material for the area and would provide a harsher contrast to the surrounding area than the existing site. Its materiality combined with its height and blank elevations would make it a very prominent addition.

Overall, the proposed development would result in eroding the redeeming qualities of the existing site and would result in the site becoming more detrimental to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposed metal clad building would have much more assertive presence

in the streetscene than the existing, particularly in longer views from the south. This would diminish the prominence and appreciation of the late Victorian and Edwardian buildings which are important contributors to the significance of the Conservation Area and Bruce Grove Station and the Post Office Depot which are non-designated heritage assets.

The height, position and materiality of the proposed development would cause a low level less than substantial harm to the significance of the Bruce Grove Conservation Area. As the Muswell Hill Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and any harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against public (not private) benefits. The proposed development would also be considered to cause a low degree of harm to the significance of Bruce Grove Station and the former Post Office Depot and the former Station Master's House as non-designated heritage assets.

Accordingly, as the proposals are considered to cause less than harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, and harm to the significance of three locally listed buildings, Conservation would not support this application.

The proposal would therefore not be considered acceptable, no heritage statement was submitted as part of the application contrary to policy. Additionally, the proposal would detract from and adversely impact the character of the conservation area and the significance of the three adjacent locally listed buildings.

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

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.

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 resident.

Due to the character of development in the surrounding area and the distance between the proposal and nearby residential properties, the proposal is not considered to adversely impact neighbouring properties by reason of overbearingness, loss of daylight/sunlight or loss of privacy.

Transportation Impacts

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'.

The transportation team were consulted and commented as follows:

Location and access

This site is located to the eastern side of Moorefield Road close to Bruce Grove Railway Station. It is accessed off an existing crossover. It has a PTAL value of 6A, considered 'excellent' access for public transport. And it is located within the Bruce Grove North CPZ, which operates between 0800 and 1830 Monday to Saturday.

Proposal and transportation considerations

The site is an established builders' merchants in current use, which operates in conjunction with a similar site located directly opposite.

This application seeks to demolish the existing warehouse on the site, which operates a retail counter and enables some storage, and construct a new replacement building/warehouse which is intended to be a modernised facility/building with the ability to store materials inside that are currently stored outside exposed to the elements and with greater security than at present.

There are two buildings on the site, located opposite each other. The intention is to close the site on the opposite side of Moorefield Road (currently used for storage) then consolidate the business operation to one site only, moving materials currently stored on the opposite site to the new warehouse building.

It is detailed that there will be the same number of employees, and the same arrangements in place for deliveries, loading and unloading. It is commented that the parking arrangements on site will be unchanged too.

There are some queries from the transportation perspective, which need to be answered/clarified to enable transportation officers to fully understand the proposed arrangements. These are as follows;

- Vehicle numbers/movements

An idea of current levels of trips to and from the site will be useful.

It appears that a greater quantity of materials will be able to be stored compared to present, so an understanding of what increases in both materials throughput and vehicle trips to and from the site will be required by delivery vehicles and collection by customers.

It is expected vehicle trips will increase if increased quantities of materials are able to be stored on this site with the corresponding increase in turnover of stock.

- Parking/vehicle arrangements

Given the above, what is the impact of additional movements in terms of vehicles parking and loading in the highway ? Photographs in the application documents show trucks and lorries parking outside so it is assumed this will continue, along with handling of materials by forklift trucks to move from delivery vehicles into the site.

An explanation of what loading/unloading operations occur at present, including on street activity is needed to understand the implications of an increase in trips and loading activity. Clarification of the numbers of employees both at present and in the future will also be helpful.

- Access arrangements

it is noted that the replacement building will be slightly set back compared to the existing building adjacent to the site access – there is also commentary that all vehicle sizes are able to be accommodated. Details of what vehicles currently fully access the site and which park and operate

from the highway will be needed, along with details of how this may change with the slightly wider area available.

- Cycle parking

London Plan requires a minimum provision of 1 long stay cycle parking space for B2/B8 land use class.

Summary

This application is for demolition of an existing warehouse at 24 Moorefield Road and the construction of a new warehouse to enable a greater volume of materials storage along with consolidation of two sites into one.

From the transportation perspective, more information is required to enable a fuller understanding of how the site operates at present and will in the future in transport terms, including numbers of trips, ability to load/unload/park within the site, and potential implications for loading/unloading in the public highway. Cycle parking is also required. Upon sight of this information Transportation should be able to come to a view.

As the application is being recommended for refusal for other reasons, the above raised further information will not be requested. It should be considered as part of any amended resubmission.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of its adverse impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area and three adjacent locally listed buildings and a lack of a heritage statement and does not comply with relevant planning policy.

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.

Recommendation

Refuse permission, for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, by reason of its scale, inappropriate design and materials, would introduce an incongruous addition that would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the THRHC/Bruce Grove Conservation Area and the significance of the three adjacent locally listed buildings, contrary to Policies DM1 and DM9 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017), Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's, Local Plan (2017), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

Insufficient information has been provided, including no heritage statement, to enable a sufficient assessment of how the existing building contributes to the significance of the conservation area, or how the new building would impact on it. No information has been submitted to quantify the benefits of the proposal to enable the local planning authority to balance the public benefits of the proposal against the harm caused to the conservation area and the three adjacent locally listed buildings. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy DM9 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP12 of Haringey's, Local Plan (2017), Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

