



# Officer Report

|                            |                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Application Number:</b> | <b>HGY/2023/1879</b>                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Application Type:</b>   | <b>Full planning permission</b>                                                                                                                           |
| <b>Address:</b>            | 7 Oxford Road, Hornsey, London, N4 3HA                                                                                                                    |
| <b>Proposal:</b>           | Erection of part single, part 2 storey rear extension to rear outrigger and amalgamation of 7no. studio flats to form 2no. 3bed flats and 1no. 2bed flat. |
| <b>Case Officer:</b>       | Sarah Madondo                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Valid Date:</b>         | 14/07/2023                                                                                                                                                |
| <b>Applicant:</b>          | Mr Andreas Dinglis                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Agent:</b>              | Mr Gary Arnaoutis                                                                                                                                         |

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **Refuse**

### **Proposed development**

The proposal is for the erection of part single, part 2 storey rear extensions to rear outrigger and amalgamation of 7no. studio flats to form 2no. 3bed flats and 1no. 2bed flat.

### **Site and Surroundings**

The site application is located on Oxford Road at the southern end of the Borough of Haringey, off Upper Tollington Park and split by Woodstock Road, the property is located on the eastern end and is within the Stroud Green conservation area. The properties at this end are all residential 3-storey Victorian terrace houses with rear outriggers and pitch tiled roofs. The terrace forms part of a triangular block with the centre filled by an commercial property breaking up the boundaries between the rear of all gardens on the block.

### **Principle of development**

Policy DM16 advises that if the original dwelling is over 120sqm, the principle of conversion can be supported. The original house is more 120 sq.m and is therefore acceptable to be converted into flats. DPD Policy DM16 set out that conversions will only be considered acceptable where they result in no net loss in the number of family sized units. The policy goes on to state that a 3-bed unit would be considered a family unit.

The proposal is for the conversion of 7 flats into 3 flats comprising of 2 x 3 bed and 1 x 2 bedroom flats. In this instance two family unit would be provided and have access to a rear garden. According to the history of the site, the property was converted into 7 self contained flats without planning permission and the flats were regularized by certificate lawfulness which was granted under reference HGY/2022/0771. Therefore the principle of the conversion has already been established as the property has been previously converted and therefore the 120 sqm will not apply.

Policy DM16 states that conversions within the Family Housing Protection Zone will only be considered acceptable where they comply with criteria (b-g) and results in no net loss in the number of family sized units. In this case, there is no net loss as 2 x family units would be provided there the proposal would be acceptable in principle.

## **Design and 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 DM1 '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 proposal includes the erection of part single, part 2 storey rear extensions to rear outrigger. The proposed extensions would enlarge the ground floor flat and the first floor bedroom. The conservation officer was consulted and advises that the proposed replacement of the existing single storey extension to rear outrigger with a full width, single storey extension would be totally uncharacteristic of the host building and its terrace, would obscure the original design of the rear elevation, which is strongly characterised by the rear-projecting three storey outrigger, and would unbalance the established spatial relationship between the house and its rear garden. The large extension would also erode the amenity character of the rear garden. The proposed ground floor extension is contrary to key principles of retention and reinforcement of established, positive features and forms of the Conservation Area, including its pattern of development, original buildings, terraces and their gardens, and is not supported in principle.

The proposed first floor extension is also very uncharacteristic of the original design of the host building and its group, would undesirably clutter and obscure the original form of the outrigger intended as an important feature of the host building and would result in an architectural anomaly in views of the rear elevation of the historic terrace from neighbouring gardens. The first-floor extension would also add bulk and prominence to the ground floor extension thus amplifying its overwhelming impact on the rear elevation of the host building. The first-floor extension is not supported in principle.

The proposed extensions would have both individually and cumulatively, result in very negative impact on the host building and its group as these would fail to retain the original design and character of the host building and its terrace as key components of significance of the conservation area. The proposed scheme would lead to a totally unjustified level of harm to the conservation area and is not supported in principle from the heritage conservation perspective.

## **Standard of 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.

The amalgamation of the existing flats would provide 3 flats comprising of 2 x 3 bedroom flats and 1 x 2 bedroom flat. The family unit ground floor would have access to garden and the upper floor family would have access to existing roof terrace which is acceptable. In terms of standards:

**Flat A: 3 bedroom 4 persons would be 73 sq.m and the London Plan requirement is 74 sq.m**

**Flat B: 2 bedroom 3 persons would be 47 sq.m and the London Plan requirement is 61 sq.m**

**Flat C: 3 bedroom 5 person would be 70 sq.m and the London Plan requirement is 86 sq.m**

Flat A would be short by 1 sq.m, Flat B would be short by 14 sq.m and Flat C would be short by 16 sq.m. Officer considers that the Flat B and Flat C would be significantly below the London Plan Standards, therefore not acceptable. In addition, one of the bedrooms in Flat A & Flat C are below 8 sq.m which is not acceptable. Two of the bedrooms in the ground floor flat do not appear to have any windows and no outlook. The ventilation and light received into these bedrooms would be very poor. Although rooflights are being proposed it is not considered these would provide sufficient light into the smaller bedroom in Flat A. Overall it is concluded that the proposal fails to provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers of the with respect poor outlook, light and adequate floor space for the individual flats. Consequently, in this regard it conflicts with HLP Policy SP11, DPD Policies DM1 and DM7 and LP Policies D1, D3 and D6 which seek to ensure development provides high standards of amenity.

### **Impact on the neighbouring properties**

By virtue of its proximity, height and length, and cumulative effect, the proposal would be visually obtrusive and overbearing when viewed from the closest windows in the lower levels of no. 9 and the adjacent garden. The significant increase in built development close to the shared boundary would also result in a sense of enclosure. Therefore, the proposal would result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to a loss of outlook and an overbearing form of development. The proposal would conflict with the residential amenity protection aims of Policy SP11 of the LP, Policy D6 London Plan and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the DPD

### **Transportation**

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'.

The Council's Transportation Team has been consulted states that the site has a PTAL of 6a, indicating it has 'excellent' access to public transport services. The site is located within a Finsbury Park CPZ. The development is proposed as car free, and it is considered that the uplift would not be significantly different from the current use. Officers note that no details of a secured bike have

been provided, and no details of a secured bin store has been provided. Therefore, it is considered that if the applicant does appeal against the Council decision, then a condition would be attached requiring the applicant to provide adequate cycle parking and a secured bin store.

## **Conclusion**

The proposal fails to provide appropriate living conditions for future occupiers of the with respect poor outlook and adequate floor space for the individual flats including the proposal would result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to a loss of outlook and an overbearing form of development. The proposal would be in conflict with Policy SP11 of the LP, Policy D6 London Plan and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the DPD

## **Refusal Reasons:**

The proposed conversion of the property would result in the provision of substandard residential accommodation for future occupiers due to inadequate floor space for two flats, poor outlook, poor natural light, lack of cycling parking storage or adequate refuse and recycling storage contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policies DM16 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) and the Major's Housing SPG 2016

The extensions would be out of character and combined ground/ first rear extensions would result in an excessively large and over bearing addition along the shared boundary with both adjoining properties, resulting in sense of enclosure, overbearing and loss of outlook to neighbouring properties to the detriment of their occupiers residential amenity, contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy D3, D6 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document 2017