



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0404
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	33 Priory Road, Hornsey, London, N8 8LP
Proposal:	Demolition of the existing row of 2 garages and store at the rear of 33 Priory Road, erection of 1-bed dwellinghouse with basement and ground floor.
Case Officer:	Roland Sheldon
Valid Date:	13/02/2026
Applicant:	Mr Neil Brock
Agent:	

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Site location

The subject site contains three single garages located within land to the rear of No. 33 Priory Road, fronting onto Ashford Avenue. The site is bound to the north by the rear garden of No. 33 Priory Road, with the rear end of the garden of No. 35 Priory Road located to the immediate west of the site. A three-storey block of flats is located to the immediate south of the site. The surrounding area is residential in character. The site is not located within a conservation area.

2. Description of Proposal

This application is for the demolition of the existing row of 2 garages and store at the rear of 33 Priory Road, erection of 1-bed dwellinghouse with basement and ground floor. The proposal follows the previous planning consents for a dwellinghouse of the same design on the site, under planning references HGY/2020/3178 & HGY/2024/1875.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The most recent applications for this site are summarised as follows:

Planning History

OLD/1964/0830: Conversion into 2 self-contained flats and details of 3 lock-up garages at rear – Gtd

OLD/1964/0831: Conversion into 2 self-contained flats and details of 3 lock-up garages at rear – Gtd

OLD/1964/0832: Erection of 8 lock-up garages at rear with access from Ashford Avenue.(33/9) – Gtd

HGY/2015/2475: Demolition of existing timber garden shed damaged by falling LB of Haringey Tree and replacing with a brick built shed to same dimensions – Refused

HGY/2016/3556: Revised application for brick structure erected on the site of a timber shed which reduces the size of the structure so that the front line aligns with the existing adjacent garages - Gtd

HGY/2020/1100: Demolition of existing garages and workshop and construction of a dwellinghouse, 1 storey above ground, with a basement level – Refused

The proposed development by reason of the constrained plot size, the position, scale and design of the building inclusive of the roof terrace and associated screen panels and safety railings, would appear visually dominant, cramped and overall unsympathetic to its context, contrary to Policies DM1, DM7 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and the NPPF

The proposed development by virtue of the restricted outlook from the basement bedrooms, unsatisfactory refuse/ recycling waste storage and cycle storage, would provide a poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers, contrary to policies 3.5 and 6.9 of the London Plan 2016, policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Plan 2017

The proposed roof terrace by reason of its elevated position and siting adjacent to neighbouring rear gardens with its associated screen panels and safety railings, would represent an un-neighbourly and unsympathetic form of development that would give rise to an unacceptable loss of privacy, to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers, contrary to policy 7.6 of London Plan 2016 and policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management Plan 2017.

HGY/2020/2552: Demolition of the existing row of three garages at the rear of 33 Priory Road, erection of a 2-bedroom house with basement and ground floor levels with roof terrace and associated waste and cycle storage – Refused

1. The proposed development by reason of the constrained plot size, the position, scale and design of the building inclusive of the roof terrace and associated screen panels and safety railings, would appear a cramped, visually dominant and incongruous form of development, unsympathetic to its context and contrary to Policies DM1, DM7 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies 3.5, 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016) and the NPPF.

2. The proposed development by virtue of the restricted outlook from the basement bedrooms, unsatisfactory refuse/ recycling waste storage and cycle storage, would provide a poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers, contrary to policies 3.5 and 6.9 of the London Plan 2016, policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Plan 2017.

3. The proposed roof terrace by reason of its elevated position and siting adjacent to neighbouring rear gardens with its associated screen panels and safety railings, would represent an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development that would give rise to an unacceptable loss of privacy, to the detriment of the amenities of neighbouring residential occupiers, contrary to policy 7.6 of London Plan 2016 and policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management Plan 2017.

HGY/2020/3178: Demolition of the existing row of 2 garages and store at the rear of 33 Priory Road, erection of 1-bed dwellinghouse with basement and ground floor – Granted 27/01/2021

HGY/2024/0966: Non-material amendment to planning permission HGY/2020/3178: - Reduction in size of basement plan and overall floorspace of planning unit – refused 17/04/2024

HGY/2024/1875: Demolition of the existing row of 2 garages and store at the rear of 33 Priory Road, erection of 1-bed dwellinghouse with basement and ground floor – Approved 15/10/2024

Planning Enforcement History

No relevant planning enforcement history.

4. Internal & Statutory Consultation

The following were consulted regarding the application:

Internal:

LBH Transportation Group: Further details of the proposed cycle storage is required. The capacity of the external bin store should be annotated on plans. Clarity required on if there are existing parking permits for the site, and if any are proposed. The applicant will need to liaise with the Council to reinstate the kerbside. A construction and demolition management plan will be required for the development.

LBH: Carbon Management: The development achieves a carbon reduction of 85% carbon dioxide emissions which is supported in principle. However a direct electric system is proposed, applicant should explore alternative low-carbon heating systems. A revised detail for the green roof should be provided to improve biodiversity value

Conditions would be provided once such details are updated, alongside carbon offset levels.

LBH: Arboriculture Officer: No comments received.

External:

No comments were received on this application. However, the following comments were received in summary from Thames Water on previously approved scheme HGY/2024/1875:

Thames Water: There are public sewers close to the development. Standard informatives should be applied if the development is recommended for approval.

5. Local Representations

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: 7

Objecting: 7

Supporting: 0

The following issues were raised in representations received during the consultation period:

- Disruption from construction process of development (noise, odour, fumes, security)
- Impact on nearby trees
- Loss of use of garage forecourt for vehicle turning will cause problems with traffic and parking and highway safety

- Construction works will increase highway safety problems and free flow of traffic
- Risk of structural damage to neighbouring properties. Geotechnical assessment is out of date
- Overshadowing/loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Concerns with regards to quality of design
- Narrowing of alleyway to rear of Priory Road properties should not be permitted

The following issues were raised that are not material to the determination of the planning application.

- There is a land dispute regarding the land in the planning application

Officer comment: Issues of land ownership are not a material planning consideration that could influence the determination of the planning application, although it may not ultimately be possible to implement a planning permission due to land ownership matters.

6. Assessment of Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Design and character;
3. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
4. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
5. Transport considerations;
6. Waste management;
7. Energy and sustainability;
8. Basement impact assessment and
9. Trees and landscaping.

Principle of development

London Plan (2021) Table 4.1 sets out housing targets for London over the coming decade, setting a 10-year housing target (2019/20 – 2028/29) for Haringey of 15,920, equating to 1,592 dwellings per annum. Policy H1 'Increasing housing supply' states that boroughs should optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites, especially sites with existing or planned public transport access levels (PTALs) 3-6 or which are located within 800m of a station or town centre boundary.

London Plan (2021) Policy H2 outlines a clear presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) and sets out a minimum target in Table 4.2 for boroughs (Haringey –10 year target is 2,600).

London Plan Policy D6 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity of existing and future transport services.

Policy DM7 covers development on infill, backland and garden land sites. Part A of the policy outlines that there will be a presumption against the loss of garden land unless it represents comprehensive redevelopment of a number of whole land plots. While Officers accept the structure is part of the curtilage of the existing property, it is also accepted that the area on which the building will sit is already covered by either a building or hard surfacing. The proposed dwelling

would have a footprint less than that of the existing structure, with the small remaining area of the frontage forming a lightwell, waste/recycling storage and hardstanding area.

As such while the proposal is not strictly in compliance with part A of policy DM7, mindful of the nature of the site and that no rear garden land would be lost as part of the proposal, the principle of development is considered acceptable here. Officers equally would emphasise that each application has to be assessed on its individual merits. The position taken here reflects national planning policy guidance (NPPF) 2024 and the London Plan 2021 policy H2 (which post-dates the adoption of policy DM7). In specific, this policy outlines that small sites will play a greater role in housing delivery and that Borough's should support well designed new homes on small sites, including infill development within the curtilage of a house.

As such, it is considered that there is scope to erect a very modest dwelling in this location without undermining the overarching aims of policy DM7, which seeks to prevent inappropriate development on garden land. This is reflected in the previous grants of consent to erect a small dwelling on the site under planning references HGY/2020/3178 & HGY/2024/1875.

Design and character

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, 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.

London Plan policy D3 requires proposals to seek to enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape.

DM policy DM7 requires infill developments to relate appropriately and sensitively to the surrounding area and established street scene, whilst providing a site specific response with at least one street frontage.

The section of Ashford Avenue in which the site is located has a mixed character, bordered to the north by the Victorian architecture of Priory Road and the post-war three-storey flats on Ashford Avenue to the south. The existing garages are of low architectural quality, occupying the full width of the site with a height of between 2.5 and 2.7 metres (due to the gradient of the site).

The existing garages would be demolished and replaced by a structure that would have a single storey above ground floor level, with a basement level below, and a 5sq.m front lightwell. The new dwelling and front boundary wall would be constructed in a red brick with large elements of glazing.

The site forms a boundary between the rear gardens of Priory Road and the Ashford Road streetscene, largely defined by the three-storey block of flats to the south of the site. The siting of the building is in very close proximity to the public footway and the rear gardens of these neighbouring properties.

It is considered that removal of the roof terrace and associated screens that formed part of the previously refused scheme means that the proposed bulk, massing and design of the new dwelling is now acceptable with regards to design and character considerations. A condition requiring further details of external materials can be imposed on the development to be submitted to and approved prior to the commencement of works on site, if the application was to be recommended for approval.

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.

DM policy DM12 sets out that all new housing must be of a high quality and meet or exceed the minimum internal and external space standards of the London Plan.

The proposed dwelling would be located over a ground and basement level and would provide a 1-bedroom 2-person unit. The size of the basement has been reduced from the previously approved development from 35m² to (as measured on the plans by the case officer) to 21.7m². Whilst the submitted floorplans are annotated to show the new dwelling would have a floor space of 58.1m², as measured on plan, the floorspace of the new dwelling would be 56.5m², which is less than the 58sq.m required to meet the minimum floorspace standards as set out in the London Plan. The unit would have a single eastern aspect, with outlook and light provided to the kitchen/living space on the ground floor.

The bedroom would be located at basement level. A daylight report has been submitted but it is out of date in that it is based on the layout for a 2-bedroom scheme with both bedrooms based in the basement level. Notwithstanding this, given the reduced size of basement, the positioning of the basement bedroom served by the east-facing lightwell, and the use of perforated railings mean that the bedroom would receive adequate means of daylighting. The ground floor layout would have an open plan kitchen and living room served by 2 sizeable casement windows in relation to the shallow depth of the room. The ground floor would also be served by 2 rooflights which would ensure adequate means of daylighting would be provided for the ground floor habitable areas.

A small 5m² lightwell would provide a poor means of amenity space for future occupants, which marginally complies with London Plan standards in terms of size.

Overall, given the reduced size of floorspace of the unit to below London Plan standards, in conjunction with its single aspect layout and poor quality means of amenity space, the proposal would provide a sub-standard form of accommodation for future occupants of the development, contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan and DM policy DM12.

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 residents.

The siting, massing and height of the proposed building itself would not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in terms of daylight, sunlight and outlook. The

building would be required to meet building regulations standards, including provision of an adequate level of noise insulation.

There are no window or door openings that open directly onto any adjacent neighbouring boundary, although there would be a southern flank kitchen window adjacent to the pathway on the boundary with the flats to the south. However, this window would be screened by boundary fencing and positioned a sufficient distance away to ensure that it would not give rise to an unacceptable level of noise disturbance from use of the building as a residential dwelling. Taking the above into consideration, the proposal is acceptable with regards to amenity impact considerations.

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.

Part B of London Plan policy T6 sets out that car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or are planned to be) well-connected by public transport, with developments elsewhere designed to provide the minimum necessary parking ('car-lite').

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'.

The site is located within an area with a low public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 2, which is low, with 0 being the lowest and 6a being the highest level. There is a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in operation adjacent to the site, both on Priory Road and Ashford Avenue between the hours of 11am – 1pm Monday – Friday. There is currently a crossover serving 2 of the single garages off Ashford Avenue. According to the Design and Access Statement, these are derelict and too small to accommodate a modern family car. As such, it is unlikely that the loss of the garages would result in any significant increase of on-street parking demand in the locality.

The proposal would result in removal of the 3 garages. Whilst on-street parking levels appear to be high on Ashford Avenue, it would be possible to require the applicant to enter into a Section 278 agreement to reinstate the vehicular crossover to public footway and to extend the CPZ by at least one parking space, through an amendment to the traffic management order, for which the developer would be liable for the costs. Whilst an additional 1-bedroom dwelling would be added to the site, taking into consideration the reinstatement of an additional on-street parking space, the development would not give rise to an unacceptable increase demand on on-street parking demand that cannot be accommodated in the locality.

Objections have been raised that the loss of the existing vehicular crossover will remove the option of it being used as a turning point for vehicles in the street. Whilst it is acknowledged that the width of the street and high levels of on-street parking means turning within Ashford Avenue is constrained for vehicles, the crossover is currently there to provide access to the site and for no other purpose.

A construction management plan (CMP) could be conditioned if the development was to be approved, to ensure that the development can be undertaken without resulting in adverse parking,

traffic and highway safety conditions, and to protect the amenities of nearby occupants. The CMP would be required to be approved prior to the commencement of works on site and for the development to be constructed in accordance with the approved details.

The development makes provision for 2 vertical bike store spaces. Whilst it would be preferable for 2 horizontal spaces to be provided, given the constraints of the site, this is an acceptable arrangement. Further details of cycle storage could also be required by condition. The proposal is acceptable with regards to highways and transport considerations.

Waste management

DM Policy (2017) DM4 'Provision and Design of Waste Management Facilities' requires all proposals to make on-site provision for general waste, recycling and waste organic materials ensuring adequate internal and external storage space to manage the volume of waste arising from the site.

The Haringey 'Waste management guidance note for residential and mixed-use developments' sets out waste and recycling guidelines for residential and mixed-use developments within the borough. 2 bins of 550mm D x 500mm W x 1060mm H would be required for refuse and recycling and a food waste allocation bin of 350mm D x 300mm W x 360mm H. Satisfactory space is provided for waste, recycling and food waste storage space to the front of the site. Details of storage could be conditioned if the scheme was to be approved.

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.

Residential and non-residential developments are expected to achieve zero carbon standards, including a 35% reduction on Building Regulations 2021 Target Emission Rates (TER) achieved on site, in accordance with London Plan Policy SI2.

An Energy Statement by Focus 360 Energy has been submitted in support of the planning application. The report and supporting documentation has been reviewed by Carbon Management Officers, confirming that the 85% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions on site that would be achieved by the development would be acceptable. This would be achieved by Be Lean and Be Green measures, with photovoltaic panels proposed for the roof of the dwelling.

However, Carbon Management have outlined in their comments that the use of direct electric as the proposed heating system was not a recommended approach, given that this is likely to result in higher energy bills. They also asked for revised elevations that show how the solar panels would be positioned on the roof. Whilst this information has not been sought, it is considered feasible for such matters to be handled through the imposition of conditions on the development if the scheme was to be recommended for approval, and the final level of carbon offset contribution prior to implementation of the development could be handled through condition.

Subject to compliance with appropriately worded conditions, the proposal would be acceptable with regards to energy and sustainability considerations.

Basement Impact Assessment

Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan requires that new development should ensure that impacts on natural resources, among other things, are minimised by adopting sustainable construction techniques. DM Policy (2017) DM1 requires that there should be no significant adverse impact on other surrounding uses.

Development Management policy DM18 ('Residential Basement Development and Light Wells') requires householder extensions for basement development to demonstrate that a proposal would not adversely affect the structural stability of the application building and neighbouring buildings; does not increase flood risk to the property and nearby properties; avoids harm to the established character of the surrounding area and would not adversely impact the amenity of adjoining properties or the local natural and historic environment.

A Basement Impact Assessment produced by Symmetrys Ltd has been submitted alongside the planning application. The basement extension will be formed directly below the existing footprint of the garage. The local geographical survey maps indicate that the site is underlain by a London Clay formation. There are not understood to be any watercourses or rivers in close proximity to the site. The site is located within a flood risk zone 1 which indicates little or no risk. There are no shallow railway structures in the location of the new basement.

Ground investigation works were carried out in December 2019 to assess the soil specific conditions and to expose and inspect existing foundations of the garage. Beneath the existing hardstanding, sandy gravelly clay was found between 0.13 – 0.7 metres, with predominantly stiff to very stiff brown clay 0.7m – 10 metres. No groundwater was encountered during the borehole exploratory digs.

The basement extension will be undertaken by using reinforced concrete retaining walls, underpinned using a well-established technique used for basement constructions. The BIA has been reviewed and found to be satisfactory for planning purposes by the Council's Building Control Team on previous applications.

It is acknowledged that the BIA was undertaken 6 years ago in connection with the originally approved scheme which had a slightly larger basement footprint than the current proposal, but the BIA adequately sets out the prevailing geological and hydrology conditions, and methods of construction to be satisfactory for the planning stage of the development.

Other legislations, Party Wall Act and Building Regulations, would also provide further safeguards to identify and control the nature and magnitude of the effect on neighbouring properties. The necessary party-wall agreements with adjoining owners would need to be in place prior to commencement of works on site. The Party Wall Act 1996 exists separately from the planning system, to reconcile differences that adjoining development might cause.

In the event that the scheme was being approved a condition would be imposed to ensure that the structural side of the basement is overseen by a suitably qualified chartered engineer. A construction management plan would also be required to be submitted to the LPA prior to the commencement of works on site.

In summary while it is recognised that certain aspects of the works here could not be determined absolutely at the planning stage, the information submitted to the LPA to date do provide

assurances that the works here could be carried out successfully without affecting adjoining/neighbouring properties.

Trees and landscaping

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. An arboricultural impact assessment (AIA) undertaken by SJ Stephens Associates. The AIA outlines that it would be necessary to remove a stem of Ash tree to the immediate north of the site, and that whilst the intention would be to retain the tree, it could be lost as part of the development. Whilst the statement indicates that the intention would be to replace the tree in the same location were it to be lost, it would fall outside of the red line of the site, so this could not be conditioned.

Whilst it would be preferable to be retained, the Ash tree does not appear to be of high landscape value, and its loss would not warrant refusal of the application. The constraints of the site would not allow for a soft landscaping scheme to be implemented at ground floor level. If approval was to be recommended for the development, a condition requiring details of the sedum/green roof could be required to be submitted to and approved in writing by the LPA, and approved in accordance with the approved details.

Conclusion

Whilst the proposal would work towards meeting housing targets within the borough, the dwelling would fail to meet minimum floorspace standards, which in conjunction with its single aspect layout and poor means of amenity space, would be considered to be a sub-standard form of accommodation for future occupants of the development.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above.

7. CIL Applicable

A CIL liability form has been partially completed and unsigned. The applicant has indicated that they wish to claim for a self-build exemption, but have not submitted the form as yet to the collecting authority. Whilst the CIL form has been completed to outline that the existing buildings to be demolished have been occupied for their lawful use for 6 continuous months of the previous 36 months, the design and access statement indicates that the garages are currently derelict.

Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge is estimated to be £4,109 (£72.73 x 56.5m²) and the Haringey CIL charge is estimated to be £25,059 (443.52 x 56.5m²). This would be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be implemented and could be subject to relief, 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 RICS CIL index. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

8. Recommendation

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed dwelling, by virtue of insufficient floorspace to meet minimum London Plan standards, in conjunction with its single aspect layout and poor quality means of amenity space,

would provide a sub-standard form of accommodation for future occupants of the development, contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and policy DM12 of the Haringey Development DPD (2017).