



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0199
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	Rear of 159 Park Lane, Tottenham, London, N17 0HN
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey upward extension and change of use from a redundant building to a two storey, 2-bedroom single family dwellinghouse with an integrated artist studio (Class C3).
Case Officer:	Mark Chan
Valid Date:	23/01/2026
Applicant:	6
Agent:	Mr Sebastian Hicks

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Site Location

The application site relates to a single storey, detached, redundant warehouse building at the rear of No. 159 Park Lane. The building has a small approximately 1.8m high roof extension on top of the building at the western end. The entrance of the building fronts Somerford Grove. The site is not within a conservation area nor in the vicinity of a listed building. However, it is within a designated Family Housing Protection Zone and is covered by an Article 4 Direction which has removed the permitted development rights for the conversion of a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a HMO (Use Class C4).

2. Description of Proposal

This application is seeking consent for the erection of a single storey upward extension and change of use from a redundant warehouse building to a two storey, 2-bedroom single family dwellinghouse with an integrated artist studio (Class C3).

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

HGY/2025/0828 – Application to determine if prior approval is required for a proposed: Change of use from Commercial, Business and Service (Use Class E) to Dwellinghouses (Use Class C3) [Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) - Schedule 2, Part 3, Class MA]. Refused 04/02/2026.

4. Internal & Statutory Consultation

The following were consulted regarding the application:

LBH Transportation Group: Raised concerns about the provision of the long-stay cycle parking, car parking arrangements and the need for a Construction Management Plan and a highway dilapidation survey.

LBH Climate Change Team: Raised objection. The submitted Energy Statement (ES) has not included any energy calculations. The ES should provide the carbon reductions at Be Lean and Be Green stages, it should be accompanied by the corresponding SAP worksheets and GLA Carbon Emissions Reporting Spreadsheet as stated in our validation checklist. The carbon offset contribution should also be calculated.

The proposed development has retained the existing walls by retrofitting. This is strongly supported. However, the development has not proposed any Be Green measures. In accordance with GLA Energy Assessment Guidance, direct electric heating will not be accepted in the majority of cases as it will not provide any on-site carbon savings in line with the energy hierarchy, and it is likely to result in higher energy bills. Applicant should explore all possible locations to provide a low-carbon heating system (e.g. ASHP).

The development has not proposed any PV panels. All new developments must achieve a minimum reduction of 20% from on-site renewable energy generation to comply with Policy SP4. This means 20% carbon reduction must come from renewable energy generated by PV panels. The ES should also include a section on Overheating mitigation.

5. Local Representations

No representations have been received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application.

Objections from the following councillors have been received and are summarised as follow:

Cllr John Bevan

- This proposal does not comply with the Mayor of London's London Planning Guidance published in March 2021 and the size standards that the mayor now requires as well as building regulations.
- A previous similar application was refused and there is no reason as to support a different decision for this application.

6. Assessment of 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;
5. Transport considerations;
6. Energy and sustainability;
7. Biodiversity and landscaping; and
8. Waste management.

Principle of development

Principle of additional housing/ conversions

The London Plan 2021 further supports the essential need for more homes and currently has a 10-year target set for the delivery of 15,920 new dwellings, of which 2,600 should be from small sites.

Haringey Local Plan Policy SP2 outlines that the Council will aim to provide homes to meet Haringey's housing needs and to make the full use of Haringey's capacity for housing by maximising the supply of additional housing to meet and exceed the minimum target of 19,802 homes from 2011-2026.

Policy H1 'Increasing Housing Supply' seeks to increase housing supply across London. The supporting text 'recognises the pressing need for more homes in London in order to promote opportunity and provide a real choice for all Londoners in ways that meet their needs at a price they can afford'. The policy states that Boroughs should seek to enable additional development capacity, including through intensification.

Development Management Policy DM10 sets out that the Council will resist the loss of all existing housing unless the housing is replaced with at least equivalent new residential floorspace.

The proposal would introduce a new two-bedroom single family dwellinghouse to the site with no net loss of residential floorspace. The proposed dwellinghouse with an integrated artist studio would have a gross internal floorspace of 70 sqm spread across two floors.

The proposal would result in the loss of a warehouse building on the site, but it is understood that the building has been vacant and made redundant for a prolonged period. As the building has not been occupied for a prolonged period and the proposal would

introduce new housing to an underutilised site in a predominantly residential area, the principle of development is on balance considered to be acceptable with regards to housing delivery considerations.

Design and appearance

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, 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, detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context. 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.

The proposed two-storey dwellinghouse would be created by retrofitting the existing warehouse building and erecting a single storey upward extension on top. The footprint of the existing building would not be extended. The extension would have a double pitched roof supported by a lightweight timber structure and finished with aluminium standing seam cladding. The maximum height of the proposed dwellinghouse would be 7.55m (6.1m at eaves) above ground level. Windows would be installed on the front (east), side (north) and rear (west) elevations of the first-floor extension. The original facades of the building would be cleaned, repointed and restored to original brick facade. The existing front doors of the building would be replaced by modern timber barn doors and a new ground floor front (east) window would also be installed.

Whilst the contemporary design and the use of high-quality materials would help to integrate the proposed extension and consequently the new dwellinghouse with the character, design and detailing of neighbouring buildings and wider townscape, the height of the ridge and eaves of the proposed extension is considered too tall and would appear bulky and visually dominate the existing brickwork warehouse building. The height and massing of the proposed extension should be reduced so that it would remain subordinate to the original warehouse and other surrounding residential buildings and not appear overly dominant nor adversely affect the street scene.

Overall, the proposed upward extension, by virtue of its height and massing, would be a bulky and overly dominant addition to the original warehouse building that is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and adversely affect the street scene. The proposal is therefore unacceptable in terms of design, character and appearance.

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 proposal seeks the erection of a single-storey upward extension and change of use to the existing warehouse building to create a two-storey, two-bedroom single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3) with an integrated artist studio.

The submitted plans indicate the provision of two bedrooms. Bedroom 1 is proposed to have a floor area of 11.8 sqm, and Bedroom 2 would have a floor area of 12 sqm. Under the space standards, a double bedroom requires a minimum floor area of 11.5 sqm. As both proposed bedrooms exceed this metric, they can accommodate two individuals each. Consequently, the proposal is assessed as a 2-bedroom, 4-person (2b4p) dwelling arranged over two storeys.

According to Table 3.1 of the London Plan (2021), a two-storey 2b4p dwelling requires a minimum Gross Internal Area (GIA) of 79 sqm. The submitted floor plans state that the proposed GIA (living) is 70.3 sqm. This total comprises 46.5 sqm on the ground floor and 23.8 sqm on the first floor. The proposed GIA falls significantly short of the 79.0 sqm requirement by 8.7 sqm. Whilst the combined living, dining, and kitchen area measures 32.5 sqm—which would generally be acceptable for communal living—the overall footprint of the residential unit is fundamentally undersized.

Furthermore, Policy D6 mandates a minimum floor-to-ceiling height of 2.5m for at least 75% of the GIA to ensure comfortable living spaces. The proposed headroom for the bedrooms and bathroom is 2.279m, falling short of the 2.5m requirement. This low ceiling height would exacerbate the cramped nature of the undersized dwelling.

The standard of accommodation is further deteriorated by poor outlook and inadequate natural light. The proposal relies on obscure-glazed windows for both bedrooms, which would severely restrict outlook and provide a substandard level of natural daylight into these primary habitable spaces.

Additionally, whilst no formal daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted to support the application, the ground floor living room is considered to have insufficient daylight penetration, further undermining the quality of the primary living space.

Finally, the proposed dwelling does not include any external private amenity space, depriving future occupiers of access to private outdoor recreation and drying space.

By reason of its substandard GIA, insufficient floor-to-ceiling heights, restricted outlook and daylighting from obscure-glazed bedroom windows, insufficient daylight to the ground floor living room, and a complete lack of external private amenity space, the proposed development would result in a highly constrained, oppressive, and poor-quality living environment. The proposal therefore fails to secure a high standard of accommodation for future occupiers of the development and is contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

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 proposed single-storey upward extension would have a maximum height of 7.55m (6.1m at eaves) above ground level and introduce significant massing and bulk to the roof of the existing warehouse building. However, as the southern flank wall of the new dwellinghouse would be over 7m away from the nearest rear windows and doors at No. 159 Park Lane and that no south facing windows have been proposed at the new dwellinghouse, it is not considered the proposed development would adversely affect the residential amenities of the occupiers of No. 159 in terms of overlooking, overshadowing nor appear overbearing.

The western (rear) elevation of the new dwellinghouse would have two bedroom windows and back onto the rear garden of No. 157 Park Lane. However, those windows would be bottom hung and obscured glazed. Furthermore, the proposed single-storey upward extension would be set back from the rear elevation by over 4m. Therefore, it is not considered the proposed development would adversely affect the residential amenities of the occupiers of No. 157 in terms of overlooking, overshadowing nor appear overbearing.

There would be first floor windows on northern side elevation and the eastern front elevation, but there do not appear to be any residential properties immediate to the north and east of the site. Furthermore, the site is bounded by a shared back alleyway to the north and a public highway (Somerford Grove) to the east. Therefore, neighbouring privacy would not be compromised by the inclusion of these windows.

Taking the above into consideration, the proposal would not result in an unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring residential occupants.

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'.

The Council's Transportation Group has raised concerns about the provision of the long-stay cycle parking, car parking arrangements and the need for a Construction Management Plan and a highway dilapidation survey.

In terms of the security of the long-stay cycle parking storage, the applicant has proposed to store two bicycles internally within the ground floor storage area. This is considered acceptable given that the storage area has a side door that allows for direct access to the shared back alleyway north of the site.

A new dwellinghouse of this size and location (PTAL rating of 2 and within a CPZ) does not meet the threshold to be designed as 'Car Free'. Given that the dwellinghouse could accommodate up to 4 occupants, it is considered the proposal would have a material impact on the existing parking conditions as the demand for on-street parking by the occupants of the new dwelling would be greater than that associated with the existing vacant warehouse building. A Transport Statement has not been submitted as part of this application and the applicant has not stated how many residential parking permits are attached to the current site and how many would be sought for the proposed use. On this basis, it is considered that the proposed development would result in unacceptable impact on the local parking conditions.

A construction management plan would also be conditioned to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority prior to commencement of works on site if it was to be recommended for approval. A highway dilapidation survey should also be undertaken prior to works commencement.

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.

In support of the planning application, the applicant has submitted an Energy and Sustainability (ES) Statement. The Council's Climate Change Team has reviewed the submission and noted that the submitted ES Statement did not include any energy calculations. The ES Statement has also failed to provide the carbon reductions at Be Lean and Be Green stages and the corresponding SAP worksheets and GLA Carbon Emissions Reporting Spreadsheet as stated in the validation checklist. The carbon offset contribution has also not been calculated.

Whilst the proposed retention of the existing walls by retrofitting is strongly supported from a carbon management perspective, the proposed development has not proposed any Be Green measures. In accordance with GLA Energy Assessment Guidance, direct electric heating would not be accepted in the majority of cases as it would not provide any on-site carbon savings in line with the energy hierarchy and is likely to result in higher energy bills.

The Climate Change Team further noted that all new developments must achieve a minimum reduction of 20% from on-site renewable energy generation to comply with Policy SP4. This means 20% carbon reduction must come from renewable energy generated by PV panels. However, the new dwellinghouse would not have any solar PV panels.

As there are fundamental concerns with other aspects of the scheme, including the design and standard of accommodation, the proposal cannot be supported in the absence of critical information in the ES Statement and carbon offset contribution as it would fail to meet the requirements of London Plan Policy SI2 and Local Plan policy SP4 with regards to carbon emissions. The proposal is therefore unacceptable with regards to energy and sustainability considerations.

Biodiversity and landscaping

London Plan Policy G6 seeks to manage impacts on biodiversity and aims to secure biodiversity net gain. Local Plan Policy SP11 promotes high quality landscaping on and off-site. Policy DM1 of the DM DPD requires proposals to demonstrate how landscape and planting are integrated into the development and expects development proposals to respond to trees on or close to a site. Policy DM21 of the DM DPD expects proposals to maximise opportunities to enhance biodiversity on-site.

Biodiversity

The submitted application form has outlined that the pre-development biodiversity value of onsite habitats on the date of calculation is 0. This is considered to be in line with the condition of the existing site which is entirely built up and contains a vacant warehouse building only. As such, the proposed development is eligible for the de minimis exemption with regards to biodiversity net gain (BNG) due to the development being below the threshold for BNG as it affects less than 25 sqm of habitat land. This is supported by the Biodiversity Statement & Enhancement Strategy submitted by the applicant which concluded that based on survey data and findings, the existing site is assessed as having negligible ecological value and the proposed development would have no impact on the existing local biodiversity. As such, the development is exempt from BNG requirements.

Landscaping

The application site is built up entirely and contains a vacant warehouse building only with no front, side nor rear garden. No green roof has been proposed to the new dwellinghouse. As such, a soft and hard landscaping condition would not be required for the proposed development if it was to be recommended for approval.

Waste management

DM Policy 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

The submitted drawing shows that the 240L refuse and recycling bins would be stored outside of the new dwellinghouse on the back alleyway on the northern side of the site. Whilst the back alleyway is gated, it is not a part of the application site. The storage of refuse and recycling bins on a shared back alleyway is not considered to be a satisfactory waste management solution as the bins should be stored on site. As such, the proposal would be unacceptable with regards to waste management considerations.

Conclusion

The proposed upward extension, by virtue of its height and massing, would be a bulky and overly dominant addition to the original warehouse building that is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and adversely affect the street scene. The proposal is therefore unacceptable with regards to design, character and appearance considerations, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

The proposed development, by reason of inadequate GIA, insufficient floor-to-ceiling heights, restricted outlook and daylighting from obscure-glazed bedroom windows, insufficient daylight to the ground floor living room, and a complete lack of external private amenity space, would provide a sub-standard form of accommodation that would result in a highly constrained, oppressive, and poor-quality living environment to future occupiers of the development, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policy DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

The creation of a new dwellinghouse capable of accommodating up to 4 occupants, in an area with a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL 2) and within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), would generate an unmitigated increase in demand for on-street parking compared to the existing vacant warehouse use. The proposed development would therefore result in an unacceptable impact on local parking conditions and highway safety, contrary to Policies T1, T4, and T6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policy DM31 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

The proposal fails to provide critical information in the Energy and Sustainability Statement and secure a carbon offset contribution to mitigate for the failure of the proposal to meet 'zero carbon' requirements, contrary to Policy SI2 of the London Plan 2021, and Policy SP4 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

By storing refuse and recycling bins on a back alleyway outside of the application site, the proposal fails to provide a satisfactory waste management solution in line with the Council's 'Waste management guidance note for residential and mixed-use developments', contrary to Policy DM4 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

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

Based on the information given on the plans, and confirmation in the design and access statement that the existing development has been vacant for over a decade, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £5,112.91 (70.3 sqm x £72.73) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £31,179.46 (70.3 sqm x £443.52). This will be collected by Haringey after the scheme is 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.

8. Recommendation

The application is recommended for refusal for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed upward extension, by virtue of its height and massing, would be a bulky and overly dominant addition to the original warehouse building that is out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area and adversely affect the street scene. The proposal is therefore unacceptable with regards to design, character and appearance considerations, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017
2. The proposed development, by reason of inadequate GIA, insufficient floor-to-ceiling heights, restricted outlook and daylighting from obscure-glazed bedroom windows, insufficient daylight to the ground floor living room, and a complete lack of external private amenity space, would provide a sub-standard form of accommodation that would result in a highly constrained, oppressive, and poor-quality living environment to future occupiers of the development, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policy DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.
3. The creation of a new dwellinghouse capable of accommodating up to 4 occupants, in an area with a low Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL 2) and within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), would generate an unmitigated increase in demand for on-street parking compared to the existing vacant warehouse use. The proposed development would therefore result in an unacceptable impact on local parking conditions and highway safety, contrary to Policies T1, T4, and T6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policy DM31 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017

4. The proposal fails to provide critical information in the Energy and Sustainability Statement and secure a carbon offset contribution to mitigate for the failure of the proposal to meet 'zero carbon' requirements, contrary to Policy SI2 of the London Plan 2021, and Policy SP4 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.
5. By storing refuse and recycling bins on a back alleyway outside of the application site, the proposal fails to provide a satisfactory waste management solution in line with the Council's 'Waste management guidance note for residential and mixed-use developments', contrary to Policy DM4 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

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>