



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/0949
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Alford Mews, 50, 52 and 54 Stanhope Road, London N6 5AL
Proposal:	Erection of two semi-detached two-bedroom houses, parking and associated infrastructure
Case Officer:	Tania Skelli
Valid Date:	01/06/20 23
Applicant:	Nick Charalambous
Agent:	Mrs Jo Hanslip

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

- 1.1 This is an application for the erection of a pair of three-storey two-bedroom houses to be sited within the front lawn of the existing Alford House grounds. The houses would be of modern brick-clad appearance, with balconies to the frontage, green roofs, solar panels, rear courtyard and cantilevered parking areas.

Site and Surroundings

- 1.2 Alford House consists of two identical apartment blocks located on the western side of Stanhope Road, north of Parkland Walk. It covers a large site, historically that of 3nos. detached villas. The blocks on site are set around a central open space with car parking. Additional informal parking occurs to the rear SW part of the site. The rear most part of the site (previously garages) has been separated from this plot. It is accessed via Stanhope Gardens and is no longer part of this site.
- 1.3 Stanhope Road is a wide road that rises to meet Shepherd's Hill to the north and forms the western boundary of Crouch End and Highgate Conservation Areas. The site falls within the Highgate Conservation Area. The northern section

of Stanhope Road is mostly lined with late 20th Century blocks of flats surrounded by relatively dense planting including mature trees.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- CON/2022/00447 - Enforcement against breach of condition 6&7 of ref. HGY/2021/0685
- PRE/2022/0003 - [On behalf of our client, LonPro Highgate Limited, we enclose pre-application design information for the proposal to] build two semi-detached three-bedroom houses on the Alford House site in Highgate. The project is located on the front facing car park within the Alford House.
- HGY/2016/1742 - Roof extension to two identical apartment blocks to create a total of 4 new units – Planning permission granted 08/02/2017.
- HGY/2016/1742 – Conditions 6 & 7 (ref. HGY/2021/0685) re: refuse and cycle storage discharged.
- HGY/2015/2463 - Tree works to include fell to ground level to 1 x Willow Tree – Refused 19/10/2015.
- HGY/2004/0581 - Demolition of existing garages and construction of new car park area and alterations to access to car park – Planning permission refused 01/07/2004.
- OLD/1962/0866 - Erection of flats – Planning permission granted 07/11/1962.

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

2.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

Internal:

- 1) LBH Conservation Officer: No comments.
- 2) LBH Transportation Team: Objection.
- 3) LBH Drainage Team: No objection, subject to condition.
- 4) LBH Arboricultural Team: No comment.
- 5) LBH Building Control: No objections.
- 6) LBH Carbon Management: Objection.

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 The application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed in the vicinity of the site and letters to adjoining occupiers. 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: 83

Objecting: 83

- 3.2 The following local groups/societies made representations:

- Hill Court RA: Objection
- Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC): Objection
 - Design does not sit well in surroundings from a heritage perspective
 - The loss of front lawn and outbuilding to the front of the site are also harmful to the CA
 - The semi-implemented outbuilding/ bin and cycle storage to front of site leaves no room for a hedge and the status of the part of the proposal unclear
 - Additional houses would result in cramped appearance on site
 - CGI on DAS p.5 'Rear garden walls' of new houses demonstrate how high the garden walls will be and the lack of outlook ground floor rooms will have
 - Potential lifts area shown on floor plans would result in cramped accommodation and insufficient living/ kitchen/ dining floorspace
 - Floorareas overall seems cramped, especially if adapted to accessible accommodation (disabled living)
 - There would be little daylight into ground floor floorspace
- The Highgate Society: Objection
 - History of development: The site has already been extensively redeveloped by the freeholder with the sale of land to the rear which involved the loss of occupants' storage, and the construction of 4 penthouse apartments on both blocks (application no HGY/2019/1059). An earlier application for a 2-storey housing on the site was refused and then dismissed at Appeal (AP/9929). It is therefore surprising that a further application for this site for 3 storey houses is now being submitted.
 - Breach of condition on penthouse application: A bin and cycle store, in connection with the application for the penthouse apartments was conditioned to be completed prior to their occupation. This still not complete and is effectively unusable, some 3 years after occupation. The

failure to complete essential facilities for the existing occupiers on which approval was granted does bring into question the integrity of the developer and puts the occupants at risk for occupying the property prior the discharge of Condition.

- Previous proposal: This is the second recent attempt to develop the area to the front of the flats. The previous scheme was to all intents and purposes similar to the current application although the number of units has been reduced from 3 to 2 and the height marginally reduced. This was not proceeded with following negative comments during the public consultation and related processes.
- Impact on streetscape: Currently the two blocks of Alford House (nos. 1-16 and 17-32) together with adjoining Prospect House form three sides of an informal landscaped "square" facing onto Stanhope Road. The "square", reflecting the open character of Stanhope Road and will be severely damaged by the insertion of a 3-storey block into this important element of the streetscape".
- Impact on amenity of existing occupants: The construction of the new 3 storey block will severely impact on the amenity of the occupants the existing flats not only of Alford House itself, but also Prospect House adjoining . They will be overlooked by the new houses resulting in a loss of privacy and there will also be an increased sense of enclosure, with the current open aspect destroyed.
- Loss of sunlight and daylight: A lighting study is submitted with the application detailing the loss of light in Alford House. This is based on sky factor calculations rather than the 2022 BRE Guidelines which operate on a median loss of light within affected rooms. In addition, there are no overshadowing studies to indicate the loss of sunlight in the gardens outside Alford House.
- Parking provision: There are issues with the parking. These are as follows:
 - a. There is a discrepancy between the proposed site plan 141_00_13_PL1 and the refuse/cycle store plan 1321/193. The site plan shows one available full size parking space either side of the refuse store whereas the store drawing show 2 either side of the store.
 - b. Caneparo Associates have provided transport notes which states that a parking survey indicates the existing car park is underused and their conclusion is "there would be no noticeable impact on the ability of existing residents to park close to their properties and the proposals are deemed acceptable in transport terms". This report has been hotly contested by the residents of the block, as noted by the objection from flat 11, where evidence is shown of repeated parking under capacity leading to parking on verges and elsewhere
 - c. The report from Caneparo Associates also appears to indicate spare capacity on the streets. This is again contradicted by objections from residents in the surrounding streets.
 - d. In the original

application for the penthouse flats, a total of 19 parking spaces is shown. However, the current application indicates 16 space which, bearing in mind that there will be extra demand from the new houses, is surprising. There is no indication as to why the 19 spaces were reduced to 16.

- Impact on open space: Currently the area in front of the flats 17-32 of Alford House is green open space, an amenity for the enjoyment of all the residents. The application statement that no green land will be built on is incorrect. A 5.38m wide strip of this green space is occupied by the new houses on and a further 5.5m will be removed from the common space by the creation of what are effectively private gardens and patios giving a net loss of 10.88m x the width of the houses (no dimensions are given on this) of common amenity space. This will result in a loss of amenity currently enjoyed by the residents as well as an increase of hard surface leading to increased surface runoff. Therefore, on the basis of the above, the society confirms its objections to these proposals.

3.3 The following Councillor(s) made representations:

- N/A

3.4 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

- Over development
- Harm to CA
- Surface of undercroft parking is undesirable
- Out of keeping with surroundings
- Loss of open space
- Loss of outlook
- Undercroft raise concerns over safety and crime issues

Amenity

- Loss of daylight and sunlight (7m gap to block b)
- Loss of communal amenities
- Loss of play space
- Lack of sufficient outdoor space for residents
- Loss of privacy/ overlooking
- Loss of the open outlook
- Proposal would leave 6.5-7.5m between proposed building and 1-16 Alford House and 8.5m to 13m width nos. 17-32 Alford House
- Increased sense of enclosure

- Placement of refuse storage outside of residential windows of no. 1. To result in noise, smell etc.

Transport

- Loss of parking spaces resulting in many cars being pushed into the CPZ
- Previous parking already lost due to previous planning permission
- Manoeuvring into proposed new parking spaces, in and out, unsafe to vehicles and pedestrians, while parking and accessing refuse/ cycle storage
- The parking plan is inaccurate. The revised plans show a new space to the side of the rear block but this is already used for parking and the plan showing two spaces on the front boundary is too narrow to accommodate two cars with the plan showing what appears to be a golf cart instead.
- The application states that the car park is underused, but the revised application shows the car park full with pavement parking visible on the aerial photograph demonstrating that the car park is well used with an undersupply of parking for existing flats. The revised application states that there will be one less space available. The revised application fails to mention the number of new dwellings proposed and the number of bedrooms is shown as unknown. The refuse provision shows existing bin stores, but this is inaccurate because these have never been completed in breach of an earlier application for flats on the roof, clearly visible in the photographs in the revised application showing the incomplete building fenced off. The council have failed in their duty to initiate enforcement action and therefore the flats are currently being illegally occupied.
- Stanhope Road is a critical W5 bus route and the works in question will hinder the street for many months and diversion will mean major delays and detours for cars as well as buses on route.
- Harder to access for emergency vehicles

Other

- Drainage issues
- Subsidence issues
- No additional affordable housing
- Fire risk regarding a gas main
- Illegal occupation of the recently constructed penthouse flats
- Lack of any provision for the storage of refuse
- The application states that there will be no loss of grassed area, but the revised plan shows that this is untrue
- Previous permission not fully implemented and potentially not compliant with building regs

- No affordable housing provision
- Disturbance during construction
- Wrong certification of ownership signed.
- Harm to wildlife
- Reduction on value of existing homes

3.5 The following issues raised are not material planning considerations:

- Right of way effect
- Health and safety concerns raised re structural failings in balconies and parts of buildings following completion of penthouses
- Leaseholders in Alford House were not officially informed. b. Neighbours were also not informed.
- Impact on property values

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

4.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of the development;
2. Design and impact of the proposed development on design and the character and appearance of the conservation area;
3. Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
4. Living conditions for future occupants;
5. Parking and highway safety;
6. Impact on trees; and
7. Energy and sustainability.

Principle of the development

4.2 The NPPF, London Plan Policy GG4 and Local Plan Policies SP1 and SP2 seek to maximise the supply of additional housing to meet future demand in the borough and London in general. A recent planning permission permitted the roof extension to each of the residential blocks to provide additional flats, resulting in the current number of flats on site at 36. This permission included a single-storey refuse and bike store to the front of the site.

4.3 The principle of introducing additional residential units at this site is also supported by policies D3 and H2 of the London Plan which seeks to optimize housing density, taking into account local context, character and public transport accessibility. The site is classed as an 'Urban Area' and is within walking distance (0.5miles) of Highgate Tube station.

- 4.4 However, whilst the provision of additional housing in the borough is a priority, the siting and size of the proposed housing here is viewed to represent overdevelopment and is unsuitable within the context of the site and its surroundings. Whilst it would provide two additional new homes, as set out further in this report the proposal would negatively affect the amenity of existing and adjoining occupiers, potential loss of a tree, the loss of open space and an associated visual gap, with harm the streetscape and the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area.

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

- 4.5 DM Policy (2017) DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to, building heights, form, scale & massing prevailing around the site, urban grain, sense of enclosure and, where appropriate, following existing building lines, rhythm of any neighbouring or local regular plot and building widths, active, lively frontages to the public realm, and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials. Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 states that all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment and create places and buildings that are high quality, attractive, sustainable, safe and easy to use. Development shall be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity which is supported by London Plan (2021) Policies D3 and D4.
- 4.6 London Plan Policy DM7 requires that development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their significance by being sympathetic to their form, scale and architectural detail. Haringey Local Plan Policy SP12 requires the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets. Policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (2015) states that proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings in Conservation Areas should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive.
- 4.7 The site is located at the edge of the Highgate Conservation Area, while Crouch End Conservation Area extends to the east and south-east of the site, including the opposite side of Stanhope Road. The wider area around the site was developed in the very late 19th century or early 20th century and includes mainly two and a half storey Edwardian houses. The historic houses follow a distinctive urban grain on both sides of Stanhope Road, they are set back from small front gardens with more spacious rear gardens.

- 4.8 The northern section of Stanhope Road was later redeveloped, probably in the post-war era, and is now mostly lined with late 20th century blocks of flats. These modern blocks, in most cases, follow broadly the same arrangement as the historic properties and are surrounded by relatively dense planting including mature trees, reflecting the overall suburban character. However, the modern blocks, including the three blocks surrounding the site, are of bigger scale, mass and height than the original properties. Due to their size but also their poor design, they detract from the character and appearance of the area. Their impact is somehow mitigated by their set back position from the street and the presence of mature trees and hedges that provide some screening and soften the overall impact.
- 4.9 The proposed new building, due to its mass and scale, but also its uncharacteristic siting would further erode the historic character of the area by consolidating and repeating inappropriate developments of the past. The proposed development would increase the density of the area, resulting in a cramped and overdeveloped area which would be in contrast to the spaciousness character and feel of the street. Existing gaps that offer some relief to the townscape would be significantly reduced, intensifying the prominence of the existing large modern blocks. The proposed development would appear incongruous with the rest of the development in the conservation area but also incongruous with the late 20th C blocks and their existing site arrangement.
- 4.10 The resulting composition would be very uncharacteristic of the distinctive urban grain, spaciousness and suburban character of the area while it would draw more attention to detracting elements of the townscape, exacerbating the overall impact and perception of the existing modern blocks. This would have a negative impact on the character and appearance of the area, resulting to less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area. The harm caused would still be considerable and for the reasons described above, the proposed development is not supported in principle from a conservation perspective.
- 4.12 The proposed development is therefore considered unacceptable in design and heritage terms.

Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

- 4.13 The London Plan (2021) Policy D3 states that development must not cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings. DM Policy (2017) DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for the development's users

and neighbours. The Council will support proposals that provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and open aspects (including private amenity space where required) to all parts of the development and adjacent buildings and land provide an appropriate amount of privacy to their residents and neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring residents and the residents of the development.

- 4.14 The proposed development would lie in close proximity to adjoining residential homes and windows. The nearest residential window is only 5-9m away (to its side and 13m to the rear). This would be contrary to policy DM1 and DM12 and guidance to retain 18m distance between new homes and existing windows. Even in the context of an urban surrounding, a distance of 5-9m, is considered cramped.
- 4.15 A daylight and sunlight report was submitted. It highlighted at least 2 unacceptable failures to meet minimum standards. Some loss of daylight is shown to result in both buildings, at lower levels, but within the acceptable BRE guidelines. However, whilst the calculations show compliance, the impact will be greater within Nos. 17-32, as expected by the proposed development lying in close proximity to its east. The main impact, as mentioned would be a sense of enclosure due to the erection of a three-storey building within 5-9m from living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms.
- 4.16 In addition, the daylight levels to rear bedroom and habitable accommodation within the ground floor of the proposed houses is considered poor and dark.
- 4.17 Both in terms of visual amenity and protection of privacy, the potential loss of the existing tree in the centre/ top of the car park, would result in the only barrier to overlooking removed and would dramatically worsen the existing quality of the courtyard and streetscape.
- 4.18 In addition, the loss of most of the existing front lawn and the previously existing front hedge and landscaping (fronting the street), would harm amenities enjoyed by existing residents.
- 4.19 Accordingly, the proposal is not considered to comply with the relevant policies to protect the amenities of adjoining residents.

Living conditions for future occupants

- 4.20 The Nationally Described Space Standards set out the minimum space requirements for new housing. The London Plan (2021) standards are consistent with these. 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. It provides qualitative design aspects that should be addressed in housing developments. In addition, new homes are expected to meet Part M(2) of the Building Regulations in order to provide accessible homes that can be adapted for a variety of housing needs, in accordance with policy SP2 of the Local Plan.

- 4.21 The proposed units are provided at 106.4sqm (GIA), over three-floors, each with 16sqm outdoor space. Whilst this is considered to exceed the minimum 70sqm requirement as set by the London Plan (for homes over two storeys), the rooms and internal layout are considered cramped, despite a generous hallway. The London plan does not recommend the provision of a 2b/3p home over three floors and there is no minimum standards for such provision. As discussed previously, the ground floor plan is single aspect, with a shallow rear patio which would result in a dark space with poor outlook.
- 4.22 The proposed homes comply with Building Regs Part M(2) by demonstrating adaptability to wheelchair use. An accessible WC is provided at ground floor and a designated space for a platform lift is shown.
- 4.23 Accordingly, the proposed standard of living accommodation is not of the highest quality as expected by the London Plan and Local Plan for future occupiers.

Parking and highway safety

- 4.24 Local Plan (2017) 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 DM Policy (2017) DM31 'Sustainable Transport'.
- 4.25 DM Policy (2017) 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.

- 4.26 The site is located to the western side of Stanhope Road, approximately midpoint between the junctions of Stanhope Road with Stanhope Gardens and Shepherds Hill. It has a PTAL level of 2, which is considered 'poor' access to public transport services. There is one bus service available within a two-minute walk of the site. The Highgate Underground Station is a ten-minute walk away. It is also located within the Highgate Station 'O' CPZ which has operating hours of 10.00 to 12.00 to prevent rail heading by commuters.
- 4.27 The Council's Transportation Team has been consulted and advises that:
- a. The site plan illustrates 17 parking spaces as existing. It is understood that four spaces are reserved for four penthouse flats that were subsequently added. Two additional parking spaces are proposed (revised parking plan). These are not indicated as dedicated to the new houses. This is considered appropriate given the site has poor public transport accessibility (PTAL 2). This is acceptable on balance, as whilst the overall amount of parking spaces is increased, it is not clear if the new occupiers will be able to access any parking spaces, in the event of the car park reaching capacity, on a first come-first serve basis. A car park management plan for the whole site is recommended to provides details of how car park spaces are allocated to occupiers of the 32 original flats.
 - b. The development is not proposed as car-capped and therefore all new residents would be eligible to apply for on-street parking permits within the local CPZ which would increase demand.
 - c. Electric vehicle charging points (EVCP), indicated within the cantilevered parking area, would be secured by condition.
 - d. A construction management plan would be recommended to be imposed as condition if planning permission was granted, to mitigate vehicular and traffic related disturbance during construction.
 - e. Cycle and refuse storage details would be secured by condition too. However, the current proposed provision is not considered acceptable. A cycle hanger is shown at 52m distance from the new homes. This is considered to far as the only secured and sheltered provision for the new homes. In addition, three Sheffield stands (not secured or sheltered) are proposed closer to the homes, however, these could be used by any visitor or occupier on site. Accordingly, whilst a cycle hanger would generally be welcome on site, the overall provisions for cycle storage are not compliant with the London Plan standards for new homes.

- 4.28 In terms of refuse storage, this is proposed within the incomplete previously approved refuse and cycle storage (HGY/2016/1742), which is half finished located next to the front boundary of the site. It is unclear if the capacity provided would cater both for the existing residents, the new penthouse residents as well as the occupiers for the new homes proposed with this application. The status of the incomplete bin and refuse storage, which has become unsightly, is currently under Enforcement investigation. The submitted refuse storage details would therefore need to be justified and conditioned.
- 4.29 New vehicular and pedestrian gates and boundary fence is proposed to the front boundary. This is considered acceptable in principle. Details of materials and operation would be conditioned.
- 4.30 Accordingly, whilst some parking provisions for the site are acceptable, the overall transportation measures associated with this proposal is lacking essential provisions and mitigation and is therefore not compliant with the London Plan and Local policies.

Impact on Trees

- 4.31 DM Policy (2017) DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that the Council will expect development proposals to respond to trees on and close to the site.
- 4.32 The proposal does not include the removal of any trees. However, concerns are raised over the protection of the Ash tree (T1) within the front lawn, which adds to the visual quality of the open space. The proposal to retain it is welcome, however, it is considered highly likely that it could be harmed and lost during construction. This would lead to harm to the appearance of this streetscape and loss of privacy and amenity to existing residents.

Energy & Sustainability

- 4.33 In accordance with policy DM21 (Sustainable design, layout and construction) an Energy statement was submitted. A green roof is proposed to the top of the building and solar panels are part of the renewable energy solution. The report was assessed by the Carbon Management Team who recommend additional details to be submitted; which could be secured in the event that this application were approved.

- SAP sheets for a representative selection of dwellings for the Baseline, Be Lean and Be Green scenarios.
- Confirmation of the carbon factor used

- Re-submission of the GLA's carbon emission reporting spreadsheet including the Energy Use Intensity (EUI) and Space Heating Demand (SHD) Table
 - Further information on Solar PV layout and specifications
- 4.34 The area lies within a flood risk zone. In accordance with policy DM26 (Critical drainage areas) a drainage strategy was submitted. The drainage strategy was assessed by the highways team and considered acceptable subject to condition.
- 4.35 Accordingly, the proposal would need additional information submitted and assessed in order to comply with policy DM21.

Conclusions

- 4.36 The proposed development would provide two new homes. However, the quality of accommodation is unsatisfactory in terms of the overall quality of living accommodation, including layout, daylight, size and associated car parking, refuse and cycle storage. In addition, its siting and size would result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. On balance, the benefit from the provision of two new homes is not considered to outweigh the harm to its surrounding built environment, adjoining neighbours and conservation area.
- 4.37 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

7. CIL APPLICABLE

- 7.1 The development provide two new homes and is over 100sqm and would therefore be CIL liable.

8. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

- 1) The layout, siting and scale of the resulting development would appear cramped and contrived in the context of the constraints of this site, resulting in overdevelopment, detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, the residential and visual amenities of neighbouring occupiers and harmful to the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area, contrary to policies D3 and D6 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, policies SP11 and SP12

of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, policies DM1, DM7, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017.

- 2) The proposed development by reason of its siting and layout in the context of the constraints of this site would result in restricted conditions of light, outlook and aspect in relation to some of the accommodation, as such providing a poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2016 and Policies DM1, DM7 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.
- 3) In the absence of clearer information on the provision of and management of car parking on site, the proposal would harm the amenity of existing residents by exacerbating on-site parking conditions and as well the proposal would provide inadequate cycle parking and storage facilities contrary to policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Plan 2017 and Policies DM31 and DM32 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017.