

Officer's Report

Application Number	HGY/2022/4186
Type	Full planning permission
Location	3 Marquis Road, Wood Green, London, N22 8JH
Proposal	The erection of a ground floor rear extension and internal alterations to convert the existing ground floor flat into two separate self-contained flats and installation of new cycle store and bin enclosures.
Case Officer	Daniel Kwasi
Valid Date	21/11/2022
Applicant	Midpoint Properties Ltd
Agent	Tasou Associates

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

The erection of a ground floor rear extension and internal alterations to convert the existing ground floor flat into two separate self-contained flats and installation of new cycle store and bin enclosures.

The application has been amended since first submitted, removing the first floor extension originally proposed.

Site and Surroundings

The application site is a 1930s semi-detached property that has been subdivided into 2 existing flats. This house and the adjoining semi-detached property are the only semi-detached properties in an area that is predominantly terraced housing with rear outriggers. To the east of the site is assisted accommodation that has been built within the last five years. The site is not in a conservation area, nor is it in the curtilage of a listed building. The site is within walking distance of the nearest bus stops A105/High Road that has access to six bus routes. To the southeast of the site is Tesco Express on A105/High Road.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

HGY/2013/0049 – Use of property as 2 self-contained flats (certificate of lawfulness for an existing use) – Deemed as Lawful on 9 September 2013

CONSULTATION

The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

LBH Transportation Team: Not Acceptable. Details of revised cycle storage is required.

LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 25 letters. No responses were received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows.

MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Design and appearance;
3. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
4. Impact on neighbouring amenity; and
5. Transport considerations.

Principle of development

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

Local Plan Policy SP2 seeks to ensure that an adequate mix of dwelling sizes is delivered within new developments while protecting existing family housing as it is recognised that a lack of family housing in Haringey as contributing to overcrowding.

Considering that it was deemed lawful for the property to be used as 2 self-contained flats, the principle of development is deemed to be acceptable.

Design and appearance

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.

The proposed development has been revised to remove the first floor rear extension, and so the revisions show that only the ground floor would have a rear extension. This single storey rear extension would create a lightwell/courtyard to allow daylight/sunlight for bedroom 1 of flat 2. It was advised that this single storey rear extension should be reduced to the same depth as the neighbouring property, in order to be in-keeping with the character and appearance of the area, but the applicant has kept with the same depth to create more room for the additional flat, which has led to the creation of a lightwell/courtyard that is out-of-keeping with these type properties that already benefit from a reasonable amount of width. So, the proposal, by virtue of its size, siting, massing and design, would be obtrusive, out of keeping with the pattern of development within the surrounding area, and therefore is considered to be unacceptable.

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

London Plan Policy D6 requires housing developments to be of high quality design, providing comfortable and functional layouts, benefiting from sufficient daylight and sunlight, maximising the provision of dual aspect units and providing adequate and easily accessible storage space as well as outdoor amenity space. Table 3.1 sets out the internal minimum space standards for new developments, while Table 3.2 of the London Plan provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments.

Policy DM11 (Housing Mix) part C of the Haringey DMP 2017 states that “the Council will not support proposals which result in an overconcentration of 1 or 2 bed units unless they are part of larger developments or located within neighbourhoods where such provision would deliver a better mix of unit sizes which include larger and family sized units”.

Flat 1 would benefit from access to the rear garden.

Flat 1 – 2B/3P (1 storey) – 62.1 sqm – London Requirement is 61 sqm – Complies.

Flat 2 – Studio (1 storey) – 40.1 sqm – London Requirement 37 sqm – Complies.

Flat 3 – 1B/2P (as existing) (1 storey) – 52 sqm – London Requirement 50 sqm – Complies.

One additional flat is proposed. Each complies with The London Plan (2021) space standards.

Although the units meet the necessary space standards, the ground floor layout appears overloaded with the increase in units in a restricted space, even with the proposed rear extension. In order to provide the proposed 2-bedroom flat on the ground floor, the proposed full width rear extension causes the need for a lightwell/courtyard to be provided for bedroom 1 so that it benefits from daylight/sunlight, as well as an openable rooflight to provide more natural light and compensate for the lack of outlook caused by the rear extension. Ideally, a lightwell/courtyard would be more acceptable at the rear of Victorian terraced property due to their lack of width considering that they tend to be narrow in character and have rear outrigger. In this case, the existing property appears to be 1930s semi-detached type of residential property that has an existing side extension, and therefore it already benefits from a reasonable amount of width, and so the proposed flats should not fill cramped.

It was advised that the single storey rear extension should be reduced to the same depth as the neighbouring property at no.1, otherwise it appears as if applicant is trying to maximise the floor area to provide for the increased number of units. However, this has not been provided in the revised scheme. So, the proposed ground floor layout is not considered to achieve a practical and fit-for-purpose layout arrangement in order to minimise noise transfer between homes, and resulting in the provision of a single aspect unit. resulting in poor quality housing, and therefore is considered to be unacceptable.

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.

The depth and height of the single storey rear extension would have a particularly detrimental impact on the properties in Parkhurst Road due to the relative shortness of their rear gardens , appearing as an overbearing development and increasing the sense of enclosure those properties experience.

The increase in the number of flats on the ground floor would result in an over-intensive use of the property that would be detrimental to neighbouring residential amenity, and therefore the proposal is considered to be unacceptable.

Transport considerations

London Plan Policy T1 requires all development to make the most effective use of land, reflecting its connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking and cycling routes, and to ensure that any impacts on London's transport networks and supporting infrastructure are mitigated. Policies T4, T5 and T6 set out key principles for the assessment of development impacts on the highway network in terms of trip generation, parking demand and cycling provision.

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'.

DPD Policy DM32 'Parking' states that the Council will support proposals for new development with limited or no on-site parking where there are alternative and accessible means of transport available, public transport accessibility is at least 4 as defined in the Public Transport Accessibility Index, a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) exists or will be provided prior to the occupation of the development, parking is provided for disabled people; and parking is designated for occupiers of developments specified as 'car capped'.

The Council's Transportation Team has been consulted. On 15th February 2023 they advised the following: (a) The site has moderate public transport accessibility (PTAL=3) and is located within a CPZ. (b) There is one existing car park space that is proposed to be retained. However, the existing parking space would obstruct the pedestrian path to the proposed flats. I suggest the one car park space should be deleted and the existing vehicular crossover reinstated as footway. The applicant would be responsible for corresponding cost of highway works and amendments to on-street parking / TMO etc. If the parking space were to be retained, details of flat to which it is allocated should be provided and a plan (dimensioned) showing this parking space (2.4m x 4.8m), a pedestrian path (1.2m wide) and the refuse / cycle parking will be required. (c) Cycle parking for 4 bicycles is proposed in the front yard in the form of two Sheffield stands. This is not acceptable because London Plan minimum standards requires provision of 1.5 space / 1bed 2person flat. In addition, the cycle storage must be secure, sheltered, and accessible. It should also be noted that occupiers of each flat should be able to access bicycles independently. Details of revised cycle storage is required.

Further to the comments, the revised drawings that were received on 3rd May 2023 show details of the proposed number of cycle spaces being increased to a total 6 spaces, that is also sheltered, secure and accessible. This would meet the London Plan minimum standards, but further comments would be required from the Transport Officer to confirm this.

Conclusion

The proposal is considered not acceptable in terms of design and appearance, standard and quality of residential accommodation, and impact on neighbouring amenity.

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 ground floor rear extension, by virtue of its size, siting and massing, would appear an obtrusive form of development out of keeping with the pattern of development within the surrounding area contrary to policies SP11 of the Local Plan 2017, policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD 2017 and policy D4 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed ground floor rear extension, by virtue of its size, siting and massing, would have an overbearing relationship with adjoining properties creating an excessive sense of enclosure, which along with the over intensive use of the property, would be detrimental to neighbouring occupiers' residential amenity contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017 and policy D4 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed ground floor layout for the two flats is not considered to achieve practical and fit for purpose layout arrangements in order to minimise noise transfer between homes, and providing a single aspect unit, resulting in poor quality housing contrary to Policy DM16 of the Haringey Development Management DPD and Policy DM6 of the London Plan 2021.

Informatives:

- **INFORMATIVE: Proactive Statement**
In dealing with this application the Council has implemented the requirement in the National Planning Policy Framework to work with the applicant in a positive and proactive way. We have made available detailed advice in the form of our development plan comprising the London Plan 2021, the Haringey Local Plan 2017 along with relevant SPD/SPG documents, in order to ensure that the applicant has been given every opportunity to submit an application which is likely to be considered favourably. In addition, where appropriate, further guidance was offered to the applicant during the consideration of the application.
- **INFORMATIVE: Pre- Application Advice**
Taking the reason(s) for refusal into account, you may wish to prepare a revised proposal for comment prior to submitting a further planning application. To do so we strongly recommend you seek pre-application advice and refer you to our Pre-Application Planning Advice (PAPA) Service.