Officer Report

Application Number:	**HGY/2023/2263**
Application Type:	**Full planning permission**
Address:	Ground Floor Flat, 8 Alexandra Road, Wood Green, London, N8 0PP
Proposal:	Replacement and expansion of existing single storey rear extension and minor reconfiguration of ground floor layout within main building to allow for retention of existing two-bedroom apartment and the delivery of a new one-bedroom apartment with associated amenity space, cycle storage and resurfacing of the hardstanding area to the front of the property.
Case Officer:	Josh Parker
Valid Date:	21/08/2023
Applicant:	Mr Sean Kennedy
Agent:	Mr Philip Dunphy

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Site and Surroundings

The subject site is a two-storey semidetached dwellinghouse in use as flats. The site is next door to Turnpike Lane shopping front which spills into the adjacent road, defined by ground floor shops and flats in the above 3 storeys, Alexandra Road is comprised with dwelling houses alike with a mixture rear modifications and outbuildings.

The submitted existing plans show part of the existing ground floor of the property as a being as a small 2-bedroom self-contained flat accessed by the front door. The rest of the property is laid out as a 4-bedroom maisonette.

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.

Proposed Development

The proposed works are as flows “replacement and expansion of existing single storey rear extension and minor reconfiguration of ground floor layout within main building to allow for retention of existing two-bedroom apartment and the delivery of a new one-bedroom apartment with associated amenity space, cycle storage and resurfacing of the hardstanding area to the front of the property.”

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

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

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

No comments were received.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

The application has been publicised by way of 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

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 from the current tenants as the works would cause considerable disruption. The owner has not communicated the desire to complete any works to the ground floor with the current tenants.

Officer comments: Nuisance from construction would be minor and temporary in nature and could not be a reason to withhold consent.

5. 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.

Principle of development

Supply of housing

Providing additional residential unit is consistent in respect of Government, London and local plan policies in respect of increasing housing supply and higher levels of density in relation to accessible locations, with both the 2021 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and new London Plan putting particular emphasis on 'small site' development.

Paragraph 69 of the NPPF (July 2021) recognises the importance of small and medium sized sites can make in meeting the housing requirement of an area, with these often built-out relatively quickly. Chapter 11 supports the effective use of land and in paragraph 120 seeks the optimisation of sites by way of upward extensions, when designed to be sympathetic to the street scene. Paragraph 130c seeks to secure development which is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).

The considerable emphasis on the development of small sites for housing, coming forward, is also strongly supported by London Plan 2021. In specific the London Plan Policy H2 'Small sites' places great weight on the contribution that small sites with within 800m of a Tube or rail station are to make to delivering housing in London, with targets set for each borough.

Garden land development

The Council's Urban Characterisation Study (2015) identifies various urban typologies where the built form relies on more or less regular street forms, building facades, and garden areas where developments on back gardens are likely to have a negative impact on the character of the area and the integrity of the street scene. Back gardens are also an important ecological resource and play a significant role in drainage and flood mitigation. The Council therefore considers back garden development to be generally inappropriate and at odds with the spatial strategy of the Borough to focus development in growth areas well served by transport and local amenities. This led to the adoption of Policy DM7 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

The principle of constructing a self-contained backland/ garden land dwelling house in land-use terms is considered by Policy DM7. Part A states that there will be a presumption against the loss of garden land unless it represents comprehensive redevelopment of several whole land plots. The proposal here would not comprise a comprehensive redevelopment of several whole land plots, but rather would considerably reduce the size/depth of the gardens current rear garden.

The proposal would therefore seek permission for the subdivision to accommodate a new house, contrary aims of Part A of Policy DM7, resulting in a significant reduction in the rear garden amenity space.

Part B of Policy DM7 notes that such proposals must satisfy the requirements of Policies DM1 and DM2 and satisfy several criteria. These include the need for any proposal to relate sensitively to the surrounding area as well as the established street scene, provide a site specific and creative response to the built and natural features of the area, repair or re-provide street frontages, and safeguard privacy and amenity.

In considering the proposal against Part B above, Officers have had regard to the surrounding built context. In this regard it is noted the prevailing pattern of development to this side of Alexandra Road is one of mirroring semi-detached properties with modest outriggers extensions and generous rear gardens. A substantial area of the original garden to this property would be lost as a consequence of introducing such an extension, with this spatially at odds with the pattern of development found in the surrounding area.

For the above reasons and discussed further in this report, the proposal is not acceptable in principle/ land-use terms and rather is viewed to be contrary to Policy DM7 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and London Plan policy.

Design and appearance

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.

The scheme proposes a 50m2 rear extension replacing the existing rear extension. The dwelling would have a party wall on the southern boundary and solid walls without windows or openings on the northern trim, to allow the existing ground floor flat access to the rear outdoor area under the large mature tree to the rear of the site. All access would be via the southern side of the property, exclusively form the Alexandra Road.

The proposed dwelling would stretch a distance of approximately 10m from the original host dwelling, although this is a considerable length there are a number of extensions and outriggers that have similar sized or larger extensions to the rear like Nos. 30 & 22. The street has no obvious pattern when considering the rear however, the depth of the proposed extension would generally be acceptable in terms of street pattern. When considering the site size of the rear garden the subject site seems to be smaller and restricted by vegetation to the eastern end.

Policy DM7 states that there will be a presumption against the loss against the loss of garden land unless it represents comprehensive redevelopment of a number of whole land plots. In this case the proposed works would create an additional 1 bedroom dwelling however, would result In the ground floor flat remaining neutral regarding bedrooms. The site has a small rear garden with large trees on the eastern boundary shading the site. Such works would remove a functional rear garden and add two approximately 12m2 amenity plots to the rear (excluding access) for each ground floor flat. These amenity plots are already small and would be buried below the existing large tree and would offer poor quality of light and outlook contrary to Policies DM1 and DM12 and SP11 which promote good design and the ability for extensions and buildings to respond positively to an area. It should be mentioned there is a 2-storey outrigger occupied as a separate dwelling at No.22 this seems to be an older development with a generous rear garden and with minimal obstacles impeding light, as such it would not be consistent to compare this example with the proposed works. As such the proposed dwelling and proportions creates negative relationships with the host building and rear gardens.

The proposed dwelling would appear insubordinate and incongruous and cause overdevelopment of the site. The dwelling in its entirety would result in poor use of a rear garden which are important to promote healthy and sustainable living spaces. As such, the scheme would not be appropriate and sensitive to the rear garden at a loss of a functional garden at the cost of needed amenity space. The proposed additions to the host property unacceptable and contrary to DPD Policy (2017) DM1, DM7 and DM12, Local Plan Policy (2017) SP11 and London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

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.

The proposed ground-floor rear extension is proposed to create no additional bedrooms except, creating a dwelling with the existing ground floor apartment being 65m2 and the extension being 50m2 this proposed new ground floor flat would have a GIA in accordance with 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).

While it is noted that areas of amenity space are provided with the two units of accommodation, such spaces are not viewed to be commensurate in size to amenity space found in connection with other houses/ flats in the immediate area but most importantly because the patio spaces in question would be heavily enclosed spaces, as such meaning the quality of such spaces for the purposes of outdoor use and enjoyment would be restricted.

Despite the fact the units of accommodation are dual aspect the arrangement of placing a large extension here to the back of the original building and subdividing the space, means that some of the fenestration to these units of accommodation would sit within very close proximity to walls and fences, meaning that conditions of light and outlook to such windows would be heavily restricted.

The associated means of access to the new unit of accommodation to the rear via the side passageway is considered to be contrived and inadequate, overall failing to provide a safe, secure, legible and inclusive means of access for the future occupiers to this unit of accommodation.

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 proposal seeks the formation of a rear extension, that would protrude 10m from the rear of the existing dwellinghouse and would be set back 900mm from the northern boundary and with a reparation with the rear of the neighbouring properties to the south. While the extension is pulled in from both adjoining boundaries and would be in part screened by boundary fences, as such not directly affecting the amenities of neighbouring occupiers in terms of light and outlook, nonetheless the extension would be discordant in nature and sit in stark contrast with the more prevalent domestic garden setting common to this group of houses. As such the residential and visual amenities to neighbouring occupiers are viewed to be harmed by the introduction of such a large extension, i.e. in particular when viewed from upper floor windows and gardens.

The objections raise concern with the disruption that works would cause on the current tenants, this work would largely be temporary, and hours of construction are restricted to working hours. Regarding daylight/ sunlight, sense of enclosure and privacy the dwelling would be acceptable.

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 application site falls within an area that has a PTAL of 6a, which indicates that access to public transport is excellent. It should be mentioned that 2-3 existing carparks would be retained.

The applicant has not provided storage information with respect to cycle parking. On the balance of probability, the location at the rear would be considered acceptable to the front of the dwelling. Therefore, on this basis, this is not considered to be a reason to refuse the application.

Conclusion

The scheme proposes an incongruous overdevelopment of the host property and by reason of the quality of accommodation and lack of acceptable use of rear garden, contrary to policies DM1 DM7 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).

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

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 £3,227.5 (50sqm x £64.55) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £3,250 (50sqm 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.

7 RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

The proposed extension would be an overly large and incongruous addition to this original property, representing a significant loss of garden land and amenity space, at odds with the established pattern of development and harmful and injurious to residential amenity to this area, contrary to Policies DM1, DM17 and DM12 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).

The proposed new flat and adapted flat would afford unsatisfactory living conditions in terms of outlook, light, amenity space and means of access, contrary to Policies DM1, DM17 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).