



Officer Report

Application Number:

HGY/2023/1554

Application Type:

Householder planning permission

Address:

636a Green Lanes, Hornsey, London, N8 0SD

Proposal:

Demolition of existing building and provision of a part single part two storey house

Case Officer:

Cameron Sturges

Valid Date:

13/06/
2023

Applicant:

Mr Andy Ulh

Agent:

Mr joe henry

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

The scheme proposes to demolish the existing building at the application site and to construct a part single, part two-storey dwelling.

Site and Surroundings

The subject site contains a single storey building which according to the submitted information, is currently vacant, located to the rear of 636 Green Lanes fronting onto Harringay Gardens. The surrounding land uses are mixed, with Victorian-era residential terrace homes and some retail-related commercial use located on the adjacent section of Green Lanes. The site is not located within a conservation area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

The most recent planning history relating to the site is as described below:

- HGY/2020/1835 - Conversion of existing vacant building into 1-bedroom dwelling, with external alterations – GRANTED 09/09/2020
- HGY/2012/1630: Conversion of existing 5 studios to 2 x one-bed self-contained flats – REFUSED – 09/10/2012 (Appeal APP/Y5420/A/13/2196271 DISMISSED 14/10/2013)
- COU/2011/00030: Unauthorised change of use of dental surgery to five flats. Required to cease use and restore back to D1 use.

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

The following were consulted regarding the application:

- LBH Transportation – No comments received.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The following were consulted:

- Neighbouring properties
- The Ladder Community Safety Partnership

The application has been publicised by way of press advert, site notice and 63 letters. 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: 6

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:

- Design and appearance;
- Parking and vehicle movement;
- Loss of light; and
- Overlooking.

The following issues raised are non-material planning considerations:

- Fire safety/escape; &
- Access concerns during construction.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of Development;
2. Design & appearance
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
4. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
5. Transport considerations;
6. Energy & sustainability; and
7. Waste & recycling.

Principle of the development

London Plan (2021) Table 4.1 sets out housing targets for London over the coming 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).

The development here is viewed to be 'backland/ in-fill development' by virtue of where the development would sit. The local plan has a specific policy on backland, infill and garden land development. Policy DM7 of the Development Management DPD states that there will be a presumption against the loss of garden land but equally the subtext of the policy outlines that for the Council to meet its housing needs, optimising existing built sites it may be necessary, but importantly such development should be of "sensitive design in order not to detract from the character of the street scene, the architectural integrity and scale of adjacent buildings or from residential amenity". Part B of the policy outlines a number of criteria that should be met in relation to infill/ backland development as set out below:

- a. Relate appropriately and sensitively to the surrounding area as well as the established street scene, ensuring good access and where possible, retaining existing through routes;
- b. Provide a site specific and creative response to the built and natural features of the area;

- c. Where appropriate, repair or re-provide street frontages and provide additional passive surveillance and increased security;
- d. Safeguard privacy, amenity, and ensure no loss of security for adjoining houses and rear gardens;
- e. Retain and provide adequate amenity space for existing and new occupants;
- f. Incorporate at least one street frontage or be ancillary to the host dwelling and the adjacent houses/terraces; and
- g. Not result in 'gated' developments that prevent access which would normally be provided by a publicly accessible street.

In policy terms the principle of residential development is considered to be acceptable, given the site is previously developed land and benefits from a road frontage. Equally, as noted above consent has already been given to convert the current building on site into residential use.

Design & appearance

London Plan (2021) policies emphasise the importance of high-quality and seek to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach. Policy D3 'Delivering good design' states that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

Local Plan Policy SP11 (2017) and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects local context and character to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. DPD Policy DM 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to meet a range of criteria having regard to the following: building heights; form, scale and massing prevailing around the site; urban grain; sense of enclosure and where appropriate following existing building lines; rhythm of neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths; active, lively frontages to public realm; and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.

The scheme proposes a part single, part two-storey dwellinghouse comprising courtyard space which will cover a similar footprint to the existing building. The proposed ground floor is 7.2m in width and 3.2m in depth, built on the boundary with 636 Green Lanes, but pulled in from the boundary with 2A Harringay Gardens, separated via a courtyard.

The 1st floor is set back from the ground floor and covers a width of 6.2m and depth of 5.2m, built on the boundary with 2A Harringay Gardens. Both stories would include flat, green roof designs with roof lights and will have a total height

of 6m. Proposed materials include white painted render, fixed aluminium frame glazing, frameless glazed link glazing, aluminium entrance gate and aluminium coping.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the demolition and removal of the building would represent an improvement subject to a suitable designed replacement, there are concerns about the scale of such a contemporary nature in terms of how it relates to this site, the surrounding area and streetscene. Specifically, such a building is not viewed to be ancillary/ ancillary to the host dwelling on site and adjacent houses/terraces; and

The plot of land on which the proposal would be built is currently tightly bound. When compared with the existing building, a single-storey structure, a two-storey building would be highly cramped and at odds with the openness afforded by the gap between the rear of 636 Green Lanes and the flank wall of No 2A Harringay Gardens, although it is accepted this gap exists at first floor level only. Such gaps are important in the layout of streets off Green Lanes and in turning the corner onto Harringay Gardens.

The corner site on the opposite side of the street (to the rear of 638 Green Lanes), mirrors this arrangement of providing a gap and a sense of openness between buildings at first-floor level. Adding such a house here in terms of its design approach, in particular its size and proportions and taking account of the size of the site would not integrate well with the street-scene. Rather it would be tightly cramped and stark, when compared with the traditional and proportioned frontages to the housing stock, which informs the character of this street.

Overall, the scheme would fail to accord with policies DM1 and DM7 of Haringey's Local Plan Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) or with policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017).

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 ground floor would have very little to no impact on neighbouring amenity, considering the windows face onto Harringay Gardens and the footprint is much smaller than the existing building.

The first floor also provides windows facing Harringay Gardens, and as such, there would be no overlooking into neighbouring rear gardens or habitable spaces here. However, there would be a significant element of bulk and scale from the proposed 6m tall part 2-storey element of the dwelling, which shares its southern boundary with 634 Green Lanes. The rear gardens of No.634 is already enclosed by the flak wall of 2A Harringay Gardens. A further large wall on the boundary of this garden would significantly impact on conditions of daylight and be overbearing. Detailed daylight and sunlight analysis has not been submitted to fully assess such impacts.

In relation to the back of 636 Green Lanes, specifically Flat 2, which would have windows facing such a dwelling, the position of a bedroom and bathroom window to this flat have been plotted in the drawings submitted to understand the impact. It is accepted that in relation to such windows efforts are being made to minimise impact on amenity, i.e. in terms of the siting and depth of the first floor. As such while impacts are being mitigated in terms of conditions of light, there remain concerns that given the closeness of such a development here at first floor level, it would appear overbearing and visually intrusive in terms of the amenity to the occupiers of this flat.

Overall, the proposal is considered to be unacceptable in amenity terms and would harm the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, particularly the rear garden of 634 Green Lanes.

Standard and quality of residential 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. Proposals should achieve the highest

standards of accessible and inclusive design, in accordance with London Plan Policy D5.

The scheme proposes 74 sq.m of accommodation space for 3 persons that is in accordance with the 70m² London Plan GIA requirement, and therefore is acceptable.

Transport Considerations

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/cycling, promoting road safety and seeking to locate major trip generating development in locations with good access to public transport. This is supported by DPD Policy DM31 'Sustainable transport'.

The site is located within an area with a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6a, which denotes excellent connectivity to public transport. The application site is located within the Wood Green controlled parking zone (CPZ). The scheme proposes a car free development with space for 2 bicycles, in line with the above requirements of the London Plan.

Waste & recycling

DM DPD Policy DM4 requires proposals to sustainably manage waste that arises from development during the design, construction and occupation phases. All proposals should make on-site provision for general waste, the separation of recyclable materials and organic material. Adequate internal and external storage space should be provided to manage the volume of waste arising from the site. Accessible and safe access to on-site storage facilities both for occupiers and collection operatives should be supplied.

The proposed drawings indicate that bin storage would be provided to the front of the site, screened from view, with this considered acceptable.

Energy and sustainability

The London Plan sets out detailed policies in relation to energy efficiency, renewable energy, climate change and water resources. Local Plan Policy SP4 promotes and requires all new developments to take measures to reduce energy use and carbon emissions during design, construction and occupation. Low- and zero-carbon energy generation are required with all new development, specifically to achieve a reduction in predicted carbon dioxide emissions through on-site renewable energy generation.

DPD Policy DM21 also requires new development to consider and implement sustainable design, layout and construction techniques, with proposals required to apply the energy hierarchy to minimise energy use in order to meet/ exceed, minimum carbon dioxide reduction requirements.

An energy report to explain how the proposal meets or seeks to address the above policy requirements was not submitted with this application. As such in the absence of such information it cannot be demonstrated that appropriate measures have been taken at the planning application stage to reduce energy use and carbon emissions and as such the proposal is considered contrary to policy

Conclusion

While noting the site here benefits from planning consent to accommodate a residential unit, the introduction of a two-storey dwelling here is viewed to be unacceptable, namely by virtue of the restricted plot size and the size of what is proposed. The development would appear incongruous and cramped, unsympathetic to the streetscene and harmful to 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.

6. CIL APPLICABLE

Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £4,776.70 (74sqm x £64.55) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £16,961.54 (74sqm x £229.21). This will be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its restricted plot size would result in an incongruous and cramped form of development, unsympathetic to the streetscene in design terms and at odds with the pattern of development to a such corner site and that mirrored on the opposite side of the street, contrary to Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies H2 and D3 of the London Plan (2021).
2. The proposed development by reason of its siting and scale would appear overbearing and visually intrusive and harmful to the visual and residential amenities in relation to adjoining properties and associated rear garden, contrary to Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).
3. In the absence of an energy report outlining details for the reduction of energy use and carbon emissions during design, construction and occupation of such a dwelling, the proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of Policy DM21 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy SP4 of the London Plan (2021).