

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4445
Type	Full planning permission
Location	88 Coniston Road, Hornsey, London, N10 2BN
Proposal	Roof extension comprising a rear dormer and front rooflight and the conversion of single family dwellinghouse into three self-contained flats (comprising two 2-bedroom flats and one 1-bedroom flat).
Case Officer	Cameron Sturges
Valid Date	16/12/2022
Applicant	Mr Hakan Latif
Agent	Miss Sophie Holt

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

1. The proposed conversion involves the over-intensive sub-division of the property resulting in sub-standard accommodation by reason of inadequate unit sizes, lack of external amenity space, and inadequate space for refuse and bicycle storage contrary to contrary to Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP2 of Haringey's Strategic Policies DPD 2017, Policies DM16 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD 2017.
2. The application fails to provide sufficient secure cycle parking in line with the standards as set out in the London Plan and therefore fails to promote appropriate sustainable transport measures to the detriment of the environment and the living standards of future occupiers of the development, contrary to policies DM17 and DM31 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and policies T1 and T5 of the London Plan (2021).
3. In the absence of an up-to-date parking survey that demonstrates sufficient on-street car parking capacity within the vicinity of the site, the application fails to demonstrate that the proposal would not place additional pressure upon on-street parking which is already restricted and in high demand, to the detriment of local highway conditions, safety and the local environment, contrary to policies DM17, DM31 and DM32 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and policies T1 and T4 of the London Plan (2021).

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Site and Surroundings

The subject site is occupied by a 2-storey mid terraced dwellinghouse which includes front and rear gardens, located towards the end of Coniston Road. The rear garden of No.30 Alexandra Park Road, whose property lies to the north/northeast, bounds the rear garden of the application site.

The site is located within Muswell Hill Conservation Area (CA). The site is not located within the borough's Family Housing Protection Zone or Article 4 Direction Area.

Proposed Development

This is an application for the conversion of a single family dwellinghouse into 3no. flats. The application also includes a loft conversion with a rear dormer and front roof light.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

The planning history of the site has been taken into account when coming to this decision.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

No responses were received from consultees.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 12 letters and site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses:

Objecting: 2

Supporting: 0

The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- Having a third flat within the roof void would be an over intensive use of the house. It would be more appropriate to have two flats instead of three.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Design and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
3. Quality of accommodation;
4. Neighbour amenity; and
5. Transport.

Principle of development

London Plan Policy H1 and Table 4.1 identify the overall housing targets for Boroughs (Haringey's 10-year target – 15,920). In addition, London Plan Policy H2 sets out a presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) and in Table 4.2 a minimum target for housing delivery on small sites is identified for Boroughs (Haringey's 10-year target is 2,600). This scheme would provide a net increase of two dwellings on the site. Therefore, the proposal would make a small contribution to the overall housing targets for the Borough and the housing delivery target for small sites, as outlined in London Plan Policies H1 and H2.

London Plan Policy D6 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity existing and future transport services.

The scheme proposes the conversion of an existing 3-bed property into three separate flats (2 x 2-bed flats and 1 x 1-bed flat). As such, the proposal must be considered against DPD Policy DM16, which relates to residential conversions. In order to maintain a supply of larger family homes, this policy notes that the Council will only permit the conversion of a larger home to small self-contained homes where:

- (a) It is located outside of the Family Housing Protection Zone;
- (b) The gross original internal floor space of the existing dwelling is greater than 120m²;
- (c) The proposal satisfies all other relevant policies, including the minimum internal space standards, the provision of satisfactory levels of amenity space, privacy, daylight, parking and access, and adequate and convenient refuse storage and collection;
- (d) The resulting units achieve internal configurations that are practical and fit for purpose, including vertical and horizontal stacking arrangements that minimise noise transfer between homes, including neighbouring homes;
- (e) The design of any external alterations does not detract from the appearance of the property or the street scene and, wherever possible, retains a single door to the front elevation of dwellings in residential areas;
- (f) The balance of hard and soft landscaping on the forecourt (including forecourts that are already substantially hard-surfaced) does not detract from the appearance of the property or the street scene; and
- (g) The proposal provides for a mix of unit sizes in line with Policy DM11.

The original un-extended floor area of the house is approx.. 160 sqm. It also falls outside the borough's Family Protection Zone, therefore the principle of converting the house into separate flats, without re-providing a family sized unit of 3-bedrooms or more, is acceptable in principle. Subject to all other relevant policy requirements and standards being met.

Design and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

London Plan Policy D3 outlines that all development must make the best use of land by following a design-led approach that optimises the capacity of sites. Proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Local Plan Policy SP11 and DM DPD Policy DM1 require development to be of the highest standard of design that respects local context, character and historic significance, so to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. DM DPD Policy DM12 outlines that extensions or alterations to residential buildings should be of a high, site-specific and sensitive design quality and should respect the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of original buildings. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriate and sensitively.

Coniston Road is characterised by terraced properties of similar design. Numbers 82 to 90 feature two storey outriggers with dual-pitched roofs as per the application property. Number 82 features two rear roof dormer extensions, granted planning permission in 2010. The property on the side of No. 90, 28 Alexandra Park Road, which forms the end/corner of this terrace, features substantial side-to-rear roof extensions, granted planning permission in 1979.

Alexander Park Road, 86 and 82 Coniston Road feature front roof lights which is a common feature amongst properties located on Coniston Road.

The terrace properties beyond No.82, of similar design at the front, feature original flat roofed outriggers. Those properties feature original loft level accommodation in the form of flat roofed extensions on the main body of the property. They also feature flat roofed rear 'dormer' elements which open out onto approximately half the depth of their outriggers.

The presence of rear roof dormer extensions, and similar roof accommodation, is therefore an established characteristic of the pattern of development of the surrounding area. Moreover, the neighbouring dormer at 86 Coniston Road (ref: HGY/2018/1126), was granted planning permission in 2018 and has similar design characteristics, including bulk, setting and scale.

The proposed size and position in the roof slope would still maintain clearly visible elements of roof slope at either side. Its siting above eaves height and below ridge height, and its use of external materials sympathetic to the original property, would ensure it reads as a subordinate addition to the roof. Whilst the fenestration would not exactly match that of the main building, its design and resultant appearance is considered sufficient to respect its character.

Therefore, the proposed dormer extension is sufficiently subordinate and in keeping with the pattern of development in the area, to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Quality of Accommodation

London Plan Policy D6 requires housing development to provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts. Dwellings must at least have the gross internal floor area (GIA) set out in Table 3.1 of the London Plan and an acceptable floor to ceiling height should be delivered. Dual aspect dwellings should be maximised, and single aspect units should normally be avoided. This policy also requires sufficient daylight and sunlight to be supplied to new residential units, whilst also ensuring that overheating would be avoided. Private outdoor space should be provided for new dwellings, in line with the requirements of London Plan Policy D6.

Policy D6 specifies that where there is no higher local standard, a minimum of 5sq.m of private amenity space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1sq.m should be provided for each additional occupant, to a minimum depth and width of 1.5m.

Proposed Flat Size Required Standard Provided Amenity Space

Flat A 2-bedroom/3-person 61sqm 70.5sqm 60sqm

Flat B 2-bedroom/3-person 61sqm 65.1sqm 0sqm

Flat C 1-bedroom/1-person 37sqm 25.4sqm 0sqm

The ground floor flat (Unit 1) and first floor flat (Unit 2) would comprise 2x 2-bed, 3 person (2B3P) dwellings and these units would meet the GIA requirements for this type of property, as outlined in the London Plan and demonstrated below. However, the first floor flat would have no access to any external amenity space.

The floor plan for the proposed second floor flat show a double bed so technically could be considered a 1-bed 2-person unit for which the required London plan or National standard GIA is 50qm. At approx. 25.4 sqm the unit falls well short of this requirement. Even treating this unit as a 1-bedroom/1-person unit it still falls well short of the relevant minimum standard. The quality of this unit is further compromised by the fact that a significant proportion of this floor space is under the steeply sloping roof slope and by the fact it has no access to amenity space.

The dwellings provided would be dual-aspect, providing adequate levels of daylight/sunlight, opportunities for cross ventilation and appropriate outlook. The ground floor flat would have independent use of the rear garden, and therefore Unit 1 would have appropriate access to an

outdoor space. The upper floor location of Units 2 and 3 would have no access to private amenity space contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan.

In addition to the above concerns, no details or cycle or bin storage have been provided. Given the small size of the property's forecourt it is doubtful that this can all be accommodated outside. Without resulting in cramped and impractical arrangement, potential harmful to the occupiers of the ground floor unit who's principal living space's would face in tot his are. Or putting addition pressure for internal storage space within some of the proposed flats.

Overall, it is considered, on balance, that the proposed conversion would fail to an acceptable standard of accommodation.

Neighbour Amenity

The size of the dormer within the property, and with a window/Juliet balcony facing the same direction as the existing rear windows on the property (and those of the ascent roof dormers/accommodation in neighbouring units), is such that the proposal would not result in detrimental amenity impacts to neighbouring occupiers.

Overlooking/loss of privacy from the dormer is not considered materially greater than the existing surrounding built environment (existing rear windows in this property and loft level windows on adjacent properties), and certainly not to a degree sufficient to justify refusal of planning permission. This consideration is reached in the knowledge that a Juliet balcony is proposed. That would not afford materially greater opportunities for overlooking over and above that from a normal window, as there would be no viewing platform constructed within such a balcony, further limiting any overlooking/amenity impacts on the rear gardens of 30 Alexander Road. The proposal is therefore acceptable in amenity terms.

Transport

London Plan Policy T1 outlines that all development should make the most effective use of land, reflecting its connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking and cycling routes. The cumulative impacts of development on public transport and the road network capacity, including walking and cycling, should be taken into account, in accordance with London Plan Policy T4. Local Plan Policy SP7 outlines that the Council will tackle climate change, improve local place shaping, enhance public realm, improve environmental quality and enhance transport quality by: minimising congestion, promoting public transport, promoting walking and cycling, promoting road safety and seeking to locate major trip generating development in locations with good access to public transport.

Developments should provide cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 of the London Plan. Cycle parking should be designed in accordance with the London Cycling Design Standards, whilst being fit for purpose, secure and well-located, in line with London Plan Policy T5. Car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity, in accordance with London Plan Policy T5. The maximum parking standards of the London Plan should be applied to development proposals. DM DPD Policy DM32 notes that the Council will support proposals for new development with limited or no on-site parking where:

- (a) there are alternative and accessible means of transport available;
- (b) PTAL is at least 4 and
- (c) a controlled parking zone (CPZ) exists.

The proposed dwellings would not be served by off-street parking. It is accepted that the application site has a PTAL of 3 ('moderate' access to public transport). 6 different bus services are available within 4 to 5 minutes' walk of the site. No rail services are within the WEBCAT recognised walk distances for inclusion into the PTAL value, Alexandra Palace Station is the closest and is over 1 mile away. The site is not within any of the Borough's formal CPZ's, the closest is the Muswell Hill CPZ, around 200 metres to the southwest of the site. It is not therefore possible to restrict future occupiers of the proposed flats from parking on street.

Given the number of separate households it is considered likely that the proposed development would give rise to an increase in demand for on-street parking compared to the existing situation. In the absence of an up-to-date parking survey that demonstrates sufficient on-street car parking capacity within the vicinity of the site, the application fails to demonstrate that the proposal would not place additional pressure upon on-street parking which is already restricted and in high demand, to the detriment of local highway conditions, safety and the local environment, contrary to policies DM17, DM31 and DM32 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and policies T1 and T4 of the London Plan (2021).

It is pointed out that as the site is not located within any of the Borough's CPZ's it cannot be designated as a formal 'car free/permit free' site.

The proposed scheme does not indicate where cycle parking would be provided within the site. To align with the London Plan requirements, space for the parking of a minimum six bicycles (rounded up from 5.5) is required. Officers note that no details of a secured bike storage have been provided. Given the small size of the property's courtyard it is doubtful that the amount of cycle parking could be provided along with the bin storage required for this number of flats can be provided.

In consideration of the abovementioned points, the scheme is at odds with Local Plan Policy SP7.

Other matters

No details have been provided regarding storage for waste and recycling. As stated above, it is doubtful that the property's front forecourt can properly accommodate the required level of cycle and bin storage.

Conclusion

The proposed conversion, by reason of its inadequate unit sizes, insufficient refuse storage and inadequate cycle storage would result in sub-standard accommodation contrary to Policies SP2, SP7 and SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM1 and DM16 of the Development Management DPD 2017, and the Major's Housing SPG 2016.

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.

6. CIL APPLICABLE

N/A

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed conversion involves the over-intensive sub-division of the property resulting in sub-standard accommodation by reason of inadequate unit sizes, lack of external amenity space, and inadequate space for refuse and bicycle storage contrary to Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP2 of Haringey's Strategic Policies DPD 2017, Policies DM16 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD 2017.

The application fails to provide sufficient secure cycle parking in line with the standards as set out in the London Plan and therefore fails to promote appropriate sustainable transport measures to the detriment of the environment and the living standards of future occupiers of the development, contrary to policies DM17 and DM31 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and policies T1 and T5 of the London Plan (2021).

In the absence of an up-to-date parking survey that demonstrates sufficient on-street car parking capacity within the vicinity of the site, the application fails to demonstrate that the proposal would not place additional pressure upon on-street parking which is already restricted and in high demand, to the detriment of local highway conditions, safety and the local environment, contrary to policies DM17, DM31 and DM32 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and policies T1 and T4 of the London Plan (2021).