

APPLICATION NUMBER: HGY/2024/0871

SITE ADDRESS: TENNIS CLUB, SOUTHERN ROAD, HORNSEY, LONDON, N2 9LH

OBJECTION MADE FOR AND BEHALF OF THE MUSWELL HILL & FORTIS GREEN ASSOCIATION.

OBJECTIONS:

1. OVERVIEW

Although the Association understands and supports the need for new housing in the Borough it objects to an element of this application because it fails to deliver the high-quality design outlined in Policy DM1 in the Development Management DPD Adopted in July 2017 and the Haringey Development Charter and Design Standards which state that "all new development and changes of use must achieve a high standard of design and contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area." The policy goes on to state that Haringey will support design-led development proposals that meet certain criteria and achieve certain design standards.

In this objection, the Association will argue that the proposed Clubhouse and flats ("the Clubhouse") fail to meet the most critical criteria and design standards stated in Policy DM1.

2. POLICY DMI A - THE CRITERIA

a. Relate positively to neighbouring structures, new or old, to create a harmonious whole.

The Tennis Club is situated immediately adjacent to the Southern boundary of part of the Fortis Green Conservation Area and is accessed from Southern Road via a path that is next to 29 and 31 Southern Road both of which are listed buildings. To the South is Cherry Tree Wood. The Tennis Club is, therefore, in a particularly sensitive location.

The site of the proposed Clubhouse is to the West of the middle section of the site, higher than the Southern third and lower than the Northern third, and immediately adjacent to the Western boundary of the end house on the Northern side of Cherry Tree Road which appears to be an interwar end of terrace house with a hip-roof presenting to the Club.

Any development of the Club requires a sensitive design response addressing these topographical and architectural challenges. Unfortunately, the proposal for the Clubhouse does not address these issues, is out of character, and consequently would not relate positively to neighbouring structures and would create a discordant element that is block-like, utilising insensitive materials.

b. Make a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area;

The mass and angular design of the proposal would be discordant with surrounding architectural styles particularly the houses in Cherry Tree Road. The proposal would therefore fail to improve the character and quality of the place for the reasons stated above and below and consequently would not make a positive contribution to "place" the essence of which has not been taken into account in the design.

c. Confidently address feedback from local consultation;

The consultation process is ongoing and the Association is therefore unable to comment.

d. Demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when it is built;

The Association cannot comment in detail however it is understood that the type and quality of the playing surfaces of the new and refurbished courts is not currently clear and should be clarified and made a condition if consent is granted,

and

e Are inclusive and incorporate sustainable design and construction principles.

The Association is unable to comment.

3. POLICY DM1 B - DESIGN STANDARDS

Character of development - Development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to:

a. Building heights;

Although the height of the proposed Clubhouse does not appear to exceed the height of the adjacent buildings on Cherry Tree Road the visual effect of the mass and shape of the design would make it overbearing and dominant when seen both from the site and from adjoining properties. This is emphasised by the third story's vertical dynamic making the whole appear dominant and failing to address the surrounding building proportions and styles.

b. Form, scale & massing prevailing around the site;

As stated above and below the design fails to address any of these issues producing a design at odds with, and dominating, its surroundings.

c. Urban grain, and the framework of routes and spaces connecting locally and more widely;

The Association is unable to comment.

d. Maintaining a sense of enclosure and, where appropriate, following existing building lines;

The proposal increases the sense of enclosure for the Tennis Club and the Clubhouse does not follow existing building lines.

e. Rhythm of any neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths;

As stated above the proposal is discordant with the current adjacent buildings and street scene. Its angular, block-like mass fails to address the rhythm of the buildings on Cherry Tree Road particularly when viewed from the gardens of those houses on the North side. The failure to address the hip roofs of Cherry Tree Road is of particular concern.

f. Active, lively frontages to the public realm;

Although the Clubhouse would not face a public road it would be visible from Cherry Tree Road and the houses adjacent to the site in Shakespeare Gardens. For reasons stated previously the current proposal would not relate positively to its locality.

and

g. Distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.

The design proposes the imposition of a building that makes no concessions to the prevailing architecture of the surrounding area eschewing the detailing and proportions that define inter-war domestic architecture and the Listed buildings in Southern Road. While the pronounced stepping of the elevations of the Clubhouse goes somewhat in reducing its visual impact the facade facing the tennis court, which would be visible from the tennis courts, the proposed houses to the South and the adjacent houses in Shakespeare Gardens is a bland, and discordant feature.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above the Association is of the view that the proposed Clubhouse fails to meet the challenges of the site, does not achieve a high standard of design nor contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area, and does not relate positively to its locality, consequently, it does not fulfill the criteria of Planning Policy DM1 and the Haringey Development Charter and, therefore, this element of the Application should be refused and the developer asked to reconsider its approach.

Nick Barr
Planning Officer,
Muswell Hill and Fortis Green Association.