



Officer Report

Application Number: HGY/2023/0851
Application Type: Householder planning permission
Address: 30 Conway Road, Tottenham, London, N15 3BA
Proposal: Erection of an L-shaped roof extension with flat roof, installation of solar panels, erection of rear ground floor excretion, new external fire escape stairs, insertion of additional windows and new balconies,
Case Officer: Cameron Sturges
Valid Date: 27/03/2023
Applicant: MR Costin Parkins
Agent:

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

1.1 The submitted application from describes the proposal as extension and general refurbishment of the property. The description officers have attached to the proposal describe in more detail the extension and external alterations proposed.: The erection of an L-shaped roof extension with flat roof, installation of solar panels, erection of rear ground floor excretion, new external fire escape stairs, insertion of additional windows and new balconies,

1.2 However notwithstanding the above description, and the fact that the applicant has completed a householder application form, the internal layout on proposed floor plans compared to the submitted existing floor plans would indicate that the applicant is intending to subdivide the property. A new self-contained flat is proposed on the ground floor, in addition to what the plans indicate is an existing ground floor flat behind the front door marked 30A. In addition, the upper floors of the extended building appear to be laid out as a three bedroom HMO, with each of the bedrooms having access to their own separate kitchen areas and ensuite facilities.

Notwithstanding the applicant's/agent's assertion in discussions with officers, that the proposal is just for extension and general refurbishment of the property, this application is being assessed not just for the external extensions and alteration described in the description of development, but also for the subdivision and change of use indicated in the proposed floor plans.

Site and Surroundings

1.3 The subject site is a mid-terrace dwellinghouse comprising flats located on the Southern side of Conway Road, in proximity to the junction with Ritches Road. The street scene is residential and characterised by rows of terrace housing of similar nature comprising rear 2-storey outriggers.

1.4 The submitted existing plans show part of the existing ground floor of the property as a being as a small 1-bedroom self-contained flat with its own front door on to the street, The rest of the property is laid out as a 3-bedroom maisonette over two floors.

1.5 The subject site is not located within a Conservation Area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building. The subject site is also located within a Family Housing Protection Zone and an area that is covered by an Article 4 Direction for HMO's.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

1.6 There is no recent planning or enforcement history available for the site.

2. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

2.1 The application has been publicised by way of 17 letters to neighbouring properties. 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: 1

Supporting: 0

2.2 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:

- Objection to loss of light and loss of privacy: The extension will result in a loss of light down our entire side return, blocking light to our kitchen, dining area, living room and bathroom. It will also result in a loss of light in our back garden. The loft extension will allow these neighbours to see directly into our bathroom and kitchen.

2.3 The above comments are considered and addressed within the assessment in section 5 of this report.

3. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 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;
5. Transport; and
6. Waste management

Principle of development

3.2 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).

3.3 The principle of altering the existing building is acceptable, subject to it having a good design, being subordinate in scale to the existing building and it having no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area or on the amenities of adjoining occupiers. The provision of additional housing at this location would be supported by Policy SP2 of the Local Plan which seeks to meet and exceed the borough housing targets through the provision of additional housing in suitable locations as in this instance.

Design and appearance

3.4 Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) (DPD) specifies that development proposals should relate positively to their locality, including having regard to building heights; and form, scale and massing prevailing around the site, 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. DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that residential extensions, 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 and detailing of the original buildings.

Roof alterations & additions

3.5 The scheme proposes a rear roof extension which will change the roof slope to a flat roof from the gable at the ridgeline of the front of the host building, extending through to the rear wall of the existing outrigger, forming an additional 'L-shape' storey. Nos. 28 & 36 both feature hip to gable dormers and the proposed extension here would extend well beyond the rear walls of these dormers. As such, the proposal would unduly dominate the outrigger's simple two storey pitched roof form. Furthermore, as it would project beyond the typical depth of the dormer extensions found in the locality, the roof of the outrigger would appear uncharacteristically bulky within the context of the wider roofscape. In addition, the extension would be largely visible from the public realm, owing to its prominent high-level position the incongruous relationship with the building and the roofscape would be discernible in private views from the rear of many of the surrounding residential properties and street, which would amount to a legitimate matter of public interest.

3.6 3no. rear doors and balconies are proposed for the rear (north) elevation. 3no. windows are proposed on the second-floor west elevation and an additional window is proposed for the first-floor west elevation. The proposal seeks to use uPVC materials for windows. 4no. rooflights are proposed for the second-floor loft, 3no. are located within the front roof elevation and 1no. is proposed within the roof extension.

3.7 16no. tilted PV panels are proposed, 11no. of which are proposed on the flat roof and 5no. situated within the front roof pitch. Whilst the principle of the PV panels is acceptable, they will be highly visible from the street given their tilted form, contrary to the appearance of the character of the surrounding area.

Stairs

3.8 The scheme includes an external staircase leading from the second-floor western elevation to the first floor and ground floor at the rear of the host property. The appearance of stairs here would

significantly detract from the appearance of the host property and character of the neighbouring dwellings. Furthermore, the staircase would not be a discreet addition which would be viewed from neighbouring properties and the street, further accelerating its incongruity.

Design summary

3.9 The cumulative effect of the roof extension, alterations and additions and proposed balcony and staircase would appear insubordinate and incongruous and cause overdevelopment of the site. The roof extension in its entirety would result in considerable bulk. As such, the scheme would dominate the rear of the property and be at odds with the established rear terraces within this area. The proposed additions to the host property unacceptable and contrary to DPD Policy (2017) DM1 and DM12, Local Plan Policy (2017) SP11 and London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

3.10 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.

3.11 A new self-contained flat is proposed on the ground floor, in addition to what the plans indicate is an existing ground floor flat behind the front door marked 30A when viewed from Conway Road. With a floor area of approximately 28 sqm, this proposed new ground floor flat would have a GIA significantly below the London Plan and Nationally Described Standard of 39sqm for a 1-bedroom 1-person unit (or 37sqm with a showroom rather than a bath). It would also be a relatively narrow and deep unit and single aspect, with a number of internalised rooms that would have no or very limited daylight and outlook. As such the new self-contained flat on the ground floor would provide a substandard from of housing contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and policy DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).

3.12 The rest of the accommodation occupying the first floor and extended loft floor appears to be laid out as a 3-bedroom HMO, with multiple kitchen and bathroom areas and what could be a communal lounge. This appears to be a well laid and generously spaced 3-bedroom HMO. The site lies within that part of the borough covered by an article direction removing permitted development right for changes of use from single dwellings (Use Class C3) to small scale HMO (Use Class C4) and therefore any change of use of the property to C4 use would require planning permission. Policy DM17 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017) requires the original un-extended floor area of a dwelling to be a minimum of 120sqm to be considered acceptable for conversion to HMO use. The property falls well short of this standard., and it is unlikely that planning permission would be granted for HMO use if sought.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

3.13 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.

3.14 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.

3.15 The proposed extension and additions would by virtue of its bulk and size result in a loss of sunlight and daylight to neighbouring properties and their rear gardens. The proposed external stairs and balconies would lead to a loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties due to overlooking which currently does not occur. An increase in comings and goings, use of balconies and stairs would amount to an increased level of noise and nuisance. As such, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties and is therefore at odds with London Plan Policy D6 and D14 and DPD Policy DM1.

Transport considerations

3.16 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.

3.17 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'.

3.18 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'.

3.19 The Council's Transportation Team has not been consulted. The application site falls within an area that has a PTAL of 2, which indicates that access to public transport is poor. It is located in a CPZ, so there would not be an issue if car parking provision was not provided.

3.20 The applicant has not provided storage information with respect to cycle parking. There is no forecourt for this property so cycle parking would have to be considered at the rear gardens of the host property. On the balance of probability, the location at the rear would be considered acceptable despite the fact that it lacks the necessary elements to access the bicycles, which would require going through the house. Therefore, on this basis, this is not considered to be a reason to refuse the application.

Conclusion

3.21 The scheme proposes an incongruous overdevelopment of the host property and by reason of its size, bulk and scale would be detrimental to the appearance of the rear terraces, host property and neighbouring properties, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan (2017) and Policies D6 and D14 of the London Plan (2021).

3.22 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.

4 CIL APPLICABLE

4.1. The development is less than 100 square metres but is for a whole new unit and as such is liable for CIL. Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £4,195.75 (65sqm x £64.55) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £3,250 (65sqm x £50 (Indexation included)). 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. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

5 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed L-shape dormer extension and associated external stairs, balconies and additional windows, by reason of their size and siting would give rise to additional overlooking of adjoining properties' rear windows and gardens and additional noise and general disturbance, and due to the size, height and massing of the extensions and external stairs would appear an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development. As such the proposal is considered to be detrimental to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers and contrary to policies DM1 & DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy D6 and D14 of the London Plan 2021.

The accumulative effect of the additional extensions would result in an awkward and uncomplimentary form of development, failing to achieve the necessary level of subordination and resulting in an unacceptable overdevelopment of the site contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed new ground floor flat due to its inadequate floor area, single aspect layout, and poor levels of daylight and outlook to would result in substandard form of housing contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and policy DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).

Informatives:

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.

<https://www.haringey.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning>

