

Application Number:	HGY/2023/0838
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Shop, 155 Mount Pleasant Road, Tottenham, London, N17 6JH
Proposal:	Installation of new shutters and partial demolition of existing metal canopy.
Case Officer:	Kwaku Bossman-Gyamera
Valid Date:	24/03/2023
Applicant:	3 Mr Kemal Koca
Agent:	Mr Halil Seker

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

REPORT FOR CONSIDERATION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

1. Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a three-storey building located on the west side of Mount Pleasant Road at the corner of The Avenue. The ground floor is used for retail purposes and the upper floors are residential. The application site is not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of listed building.

2. Details of Proposal

This is a retrospective planning application for the construction of front extension in a form of aluminium posts frame with lightweight polycarbonate sheeting on top. This replaces existing permanent canopy to the front of the premises, which serves the ground floor retail premises for the display of fruit and vegetables.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

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

- HGY/2023/1202 – GRANTED 19/05/2023 - Proposed new fascia sign and associated signs to front and side elevation.
- HGY/2023/0703 – GRANTED 05/05/2023 - Proposed ground floor rear infill extension with a new staircase to first floor flat.

- HGY/2003/0215 – REF 28/03/2003 - Erection of semi-permanent framework to support lightweight solid roof and metal roller shutters on private forecourt.
- HGY/2001/0544 – GRANTED 11/05/2001 - Conversion of existing first floor into one bedroom self-contained flat and existing second floor into a two-bedroom self-contained flat.
- HGY/1991/0958 – GRANTED 13/10/1992 - Single storey rear extension.

Enforcement

- ENF/2023/0383 – Enforcement investigation into unauthorised works – installation of permanent brick structure outside premises dated 04/09/2023.

4. Internal & Statutory Consultation

None

5. Local Representations

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: 1

Supporting: 1

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Design and visual appearance and impact on amenity.

Design and visual appearance and impact on amenity

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 application building is a former large brick public house in an eye-catching location at a main street corner within the area. This attractive three-storey building has frontages on two main streets with detailing at first and second floors. It is one of pair of more attractive and characterful ones in the immediate vicinity and as such this historic building, whilst not listed, contributes substantially to the character and appearance of the locality.

From the outside at street level, it is in use as green grocery shop, and along Mount Pleasant Road, has been extended onto the front boundary in line with neighbouring residential garden walls. There is a low brick wall, supported on steel posts between with glazing windows on all side. The flat roof is finished with solid sheeting and shutters.

The existing solid permanent extension extends across the front of the premise. It also projects a significant distance outward from the front elevation. Therefore, the extension is of a substantial size. Owing to the size and its design including flat roof detail, the extension has a rather squat profile. Additionally, the front extension has been constructed of utilitarian external materials, consisting of aluminium frame with clear glazing and low brick base. None of the above factors pay any meaningful regards to the architectural forms and external materials typical of traditional buildings in the surrounding area, significantly obscuring the view of the historic frontage. While the forecourt is bounded by a front boundary wall on one side, this is not in line with the host buildings, jutting out and obscuring the frontage, as such, taking all of the above factors into account, the front extension fails to integrate satisfactorily with host building or surrounding development, and it appears as an awkward, obvious and alien addition to the premises in the street scene. Consequently, the extension causes unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.

The proposal would interrupt the original vertical rhythm of the building and add to the accumulation of clutter to the building, which detract from its original frontage. Although an attempt to replicate some of the original façade details on the extension, but there is very little detail in the application materials, and nothing to suggest this would be done carefully or with attention to materials, details and craftsmanship. The proposal would badly detract from the character of the original building by projecting forward of the original building line an obscuring the composition and host building.

The introduction of a solid front extension to the building would have bulky appearance and would add unsightly clutter to the front elevation of the host building. This would result in a large harsh drab expanse of wall lacking interest at street level, which is wholly at odds with the attractive design and high-quality craftsmanship of the upper floors of the host building.

The existing extension fails to accord with Policy DM1 of the adopted DPD, as its siting, character and appearance does not respect the site and its surroundings, and it is detrimental to the built environment and the character of this part of the Borough. The front extension is also inconsistent with the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) at section 12 concerning achieving well designed places, as it is not visually attractive, it does not maintain a strong sense of place and it fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of the area.

7. Conclusion

The existing front extension enclosure of the forecourt of the shop by reason its form, size, design and siting would relate poorly to the original building and would appear as a visually obtrusive and unattractive addition to the street scene in a prominent location, to the detriment of local visual amenity of the area contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy D4 of the adopted London Plan 2021.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be granted for the reasons set out above. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION.

8. 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.

9. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSED PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The existing front extension enclosure of the forecourt of the shop by reason its form, size, design and siting would relate poorly to the original building and would appear as a visually obtrusive and unattractive addition to the street scene in a prominent location, to the detriment of local visual amenity of the area contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy D4 of the adopted London Plan 2021.