



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0609		
Application Type:	Full planning permission		
Address:	1 Church Road, London, N6 4QH		
Proposal:	Construction of a two-storey residential infill dwelling within the curtilage of 1 Church Road, including associated landscaping, refuse and cycle storage.		
Case Officer:	Adam Silverwood		
Valid Date:	16/03/2026		
Applicant:	Mr Alfie Swift-Barnard		
Agent:	Mr Sam Bottomley		

1. Proposed Development

This is an application for a two-storey single dwelling.

2. Site and Surroundings

The application site comprises a vacant parcel of land located between the rear of No. 1 Church Road and No. 3 Church Road, close to the corner of Talbot Street. Church Road is a predominantly residential street characterised by a mix of architectural styles dating from the mid-19th century to the 1950s. Its established character is defined by terraced and semi-detached dwellings, together with flatted developments that front the street and incorporate modest front gardens, creating a relatively consistent streetscape. Mature trees and vegetation within property boundaries further contribute to the area's character.

The site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area. A small shed currently occupies the site and would be demolished as part of the proposed development.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

OLD/1973/0208 - Conversion into three self-contained flats. – Approved with Conditions: 24/01/1973

HGY/1991/0674 - Change of use from part residential and part nursery to a private school for 5–7-year-olds involving the erection of a fire escape and roof terrace at rear of property. – Refused: 04/08/1992

HGY/2017/3396 - Removal of rear additions, erection of two-storey stepped rear extension and conversion of upper floors from one flat and two bedsits into three self-contained flats, retaining the day nursery use on extended ground floor. – Approved With Conditions: 16/01/2018

HGY/2019/0389 - Adding an external timber and glass stair from first floor to ground level to provide access to rear garden. – Refused: 19/03/2019

HGY/2020/1162 - Erection of external rear metal staircase to first floor, replacement timber boundary fence (in association with development approved under planning reference HGY/2016/3651). – Refused: 30/06/2020

5. Consolation Responses and Local Representations

The application has been publicised by way of letters sent to neighbouring properties, a site notice placed within the vicinity of the site and advertisement in a local paper. Five objections were received from local residents. These can be summarised as:

- Overdevelopment
- Harm to the Conservation area
- Detrimental to neighbourhood amenity
- Structural risk to neighbouring properties
- Highways impact from construction
- Not in keeping with the pattern of development of the area

These matters will be considered within the relevant sections of the report.

LBH Conservation

"The development site forms part of the original curtilage to the heavily extended, positive contributor at No 1 Church Road and still reads as a modestly sized, leafy side garden in street views along Church Road where the site is enclosed by a simple timber fencing and is perceived as undeveloped behind its enclosure.

The proposed development will have a negative impact on the character of this stretch of the Highgate Conservation Area due to its uncharacteristic two storey bulk and undesirably prominent appearance on the street frontage of Church Road, also due to the obscuring of the established visual gap between the clearly legible rear

elevations and rear gardens of the terrace fronting Talbot Road and the building at 3-5 Church Road.

The proposed development pushes the bulk of the first floor to the shared boundary with No. 3 Church Road and adjacent flats, and as much as this design choice tries to mitigate the impact of the proposed development on the existing views of greenery behind the fencing, as already advised at pre-application stage, the proposed building will still prominently appear as an uncharacteristic and distracting anomaly within the street scene, and this is also due to the forward projecting building line that is so close to the pavement and accentuates the presence of the proposed building that will very undesirably compete with the host building and cannot be supported from the conservation stance.'

LBH Carbon Management

The application has not submitted an energy statement.

LBH Arboriculture

'Regarding the above planning application and proposal, I hold no objections providing the whole of the tree report is conditioned.'

Highgate Area Conservation Action Committee

The CAAC objects to the proposal on the grounds that it would infill an existing gap along Church Road, blocking views of rear gardens and mature trees and eroding the leafy character identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal. It is argued that the development would disrupt the standalone form and symmetry of the adjacent flats at 3-5 Church Road, harming townscape quality and the character of this part of the Highgate Conservation Area.

The objection raises concerns regarding the loss of garden land associated with No. 1 Church Road, noting that the proposal would result in a significant further reduction of private outdoor amenity when compared to historic levels. It is contended that the remaining outdoor space for both the existing and proposed dwellings would be insufficient.

Concerns are also raised regarding the quality of accommodation within the proposed dwelling, including inadequate daylight, outlook, ventilation, internal layout, storage provision and compliance with London Housing Design Standards. Potential overlooking from the proposed roof terrace and future occupation levels exceeding those stated are also cited.

Additional objections relate to the lack of submitted sustainability and energy information, insufficient consideration of existing trees, the absence of meaningful front landscaping, uncertainty regarding sustainable drainage, and the overall failure of the proposal to meet best practice design standards.

The Highgate Society

In summary objects to the proposal on the grounds that the application site is not an incidental or ancillary parcel of land, as described by the applicant, but forms the rear garden of No. 1 Church Road. The Society considers the proposed development to represent unacceptable backland development that would result in the loss of private garden land, contrary to policies in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan and Local Plan.

Objection is raised to the bulk, scale and dominant appearance of the proposed two-storey dwelling, which is considered to fill an existing gap between buildings, reduce visual separation, and harm views of mature rear garden spaces that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

The Society further contends that the proposal would adversely affect neighbouring amenity, including light and spatial awareness, and would undermine the setting of the conservation area. It is argued that the development conflicts with policies intended to resist garden loss and safeguard the open spaces between buildings, and that approval would set an undesirable precedent.

6. Material Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of Development
2. Design and heritage
3. Quality of Accommodation
4. Impact on Neighbourhood Amenity
5. Sustainability
6. Transport
7. Waste
8. Trees

Principle of Development

National, regional and local planning policy places significant emphasis on the delivery of new housing, including on small sites. The London Plan (2021) identifies a

ten-year housing target for Haringey of 15,920 dwellings, with approximately 2,600 expected to be delivered on small sites. This approach is reflected in Haringey Local Plan Policy SP2, which seeks to maximise the borough's housing capacity, and in London Plan Policy H1, which highlights the pressing need to increase housing supply through appropriate intensification. National policy similarly recognises the important role of small and medium-sized sites in meeting housing needs, provided development optimises land in a way that responds positively to local character. However, support for additional housing is not unconditional. London Plan Policy H2 (Small Sites) makes clear that new development must respect the character, form and layout of the surrounding area, and the National Planning Policy Framework requires new development to be sympathetic to local character and to create places with a high standard of amenity. These requirements are particularly important in sensitive heritage locations.

At the local level, Policy DM7 of the Development Management DPD sets out a specific and restrictive framework for assessing backland and infill development. It requires proposals to relate sensitively to the surrounding area and established street scene; provide a site-specific and creative response to the built and natural features of the area; safeguard privacy and amenity; avoid the loss of usable private amenity space; and, where appropriate, respect existing front and rear building lines and spatial relationships. The policy also discourages development that disrupts established patterns of development or results in visually intrusive infill.

This approach is reinforced by Policy DH10 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, which confirms a presumption against backland development involving the loss of garden land, in line with higher-level policies, and emphasises the importance of maintaining spatial gaps, garden settings and established building lines that contribute positively to the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

The proposal would comprise a single new dwelling on a small parcel of land within an established residential area and within the Highgate Conservation Area. While it is acknowledged that planning policy supports the delivery of new homes on small sites in principle, this support is subject to the development being capable of being accommodated without harm to heritage significance, townscape character, residential amenity or the quality of accommodation provided.

The acceptability of development on this site is therefore dependent on detailed consideration of its design, scale and form, impact on the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, effects on neighbouring amenity, loss of garden land, and the quality and sustainability of the proposed accommodation. These matters are assessed in detail in the subsequent sections of this report and, taken

together, demonstrate that the site cannot accommodate a new dwelling of the scale and form proposed without causing unacceptable harm.

Accordingly, while additional housing is supported in principle at a strategic level, the principle of introducing a new dwelling on this particular site is not accepted in this instance.

Design and heritage

Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) requires all new development to achieve a high standard of design that contributes positively to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area. Development must relate appropriately to neighbouring buildings, respond positively to local context, and demonstrate how the quality of the development will be secured when built. These requirements are particularly critical where proposals affect sensitive historic environments.

Policy DM9 of the Development Management DPD requires that development affecting a designated heritage asset, including a conservation area, is assessed having regard to the significance of the asset and the contribution of its setting. Proposals must preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area and demonstrate a high-quality, site-specific and sensitive design that respects prevailing form, scale, proportions, spatial qualities and architectural character.

The proposal must also be assessed against Policy DM7, which establishes a restrictive framework for backland, infill and garden-land development. DM7 recognises that such sites are inherently sensitive and requires development to relate appropriately and sensitively to the surrounding area and established street scene, preserve spatial qualities and openness, safeguard amenity, and avoid visually intrusive or dominant forms of development. There is a presumption against the loss of garden land where this would result in harm to character, amenity or heritage significance.

Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan reinforces these requirements, stating that development within the Highgate Conservation Area must preserve or enhance its character and appearance and respect the setting of heritage assets. The policy and its supporting text emphasise the importance of gaps between buildings, views through to gardens, leafy character and spatial openness as defining features of the area.

The application site lies within the Highgate Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies Church Road as having a "leafy aspect", particularly at its eastern end, and describes Talbot Street as an attractive suburban road characterised

by relatively large two- and three-storey Edwardian houses set within generous plots. The appraisal identifies gaps between buildings, views through to rear gardens, and the overall sense of openness and greenery as positive contributors to the character and significance of the Conservation Area.

The proposed development comprises a compact two-storey dwelling of a square, stacked-box form, with a maximum height of approximately 5.7 metres. The ground-floor footprint would measure approximately 8.6 metres by 5.7 metres, with a reduced first-floor footprint of approximately 7.8 metres by 5 metres. The scheme includes a street-facing terrace at first-floor level above the entrance, a small front patio set slightly back from the pavement to accommodate bins and cycle storage, and a green roof. External materials are proposed to be brick cladding with white window frames, with white-painted brick walls to the internal courtyard areas.

While it is acknowledged that modern infill development exists within the wider area, such examples are typically discreet in form, screened from public view, or located behind existing buildings such that their impact on the conservation area and street scene is minimal. The example of 6a Church Road, cited by the applicant, is a single-storey dwelling that is substantially concealed from public vantage points. This development is therefore not directly comparable to the proposal under consideration.

By contrast, the proposed dwelling would be exceptionally prominent within the street scene. It would be positioned approximately 1.9 metres forward of the established building line, occupying a visually sensitive gap between existing buildings. The siting, scale and massing of the proposal would interrupt the established rhythm of development along Church Road and introduce a conspicuously modern built form that would read as incongruous within its historic context.

The Conservation Officer considers that the proposal fails to respond appropriately to the defining characteristics of the Highgate Conservation Area. The design does not reference or reinterpret the prevailing architectural language, proportions or spatial qualities of the surrounding Edwardian and Victorian buildings, nor does it demonstrate a conservation-led contemporary approach that would justify such a prominent and exposed intervention. Instead, the compact massing, flat-roofed stacked form and street-facing terrace would result in a visually assertive and discordant addition that would undermine the established character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

Although the applicant has sought to mitigate impacts through a setback at first-floor level and the introduction of a small front patio, these measures are insufficient. The introduction of a two-storey form within such a constrained

backland and infill plot would materially reduce the sense of openness between buildings and block views towards the rear gardens of properties along Talbot Street, contributing to a cramped and overdeveloped appearance. This effect would be exacerbated by the forward siting of the building and its strong horizontal emphasis. While it is acknowledged that views to the rear of properties are not, in themselves, the sole defining feature of a conservation area, the overall sense of openness, greenery and spacing between buildings is a key component of the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area. The proposal would erode these spatial qualities and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area, contrary to Policies DM7, DM9 and DH2.

Furthermore, while front gardens are a consistent and positive feature of the conservation area, street-facing balconies and terraces are not. The proposed first-floor terrace, located approximately 2.8 metres above ground level and just 1.8 metres from the pavement edge, would be an intrusive and uncharacteristic feature within the street scene and would further undermine the established townscape pattern.

Taken together, the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area through the erosion of openness, disruption of spatial relationships, loss of garden land, and introduction of a visually prominent and incongruous built form on a sensitive backland/infill site. While the development would deliver a single additional dwelling, this limited public benefit is not considered to be of sufficient weight to outweigh the identified heritage harm.

Accordingly, having regard to the statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, it is concluded that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policies DM1, DM7 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD, London Plan Policy D3, and Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, and is unacceptable in design and heritage terms.

Quality of Accommodation

London Plan Policy D6 requires housing developments to provide high-quality accommodation, including comfortable and functional internal layouts, adequate levels of daylight and sunlight, the maximisation of dual-aspect units where possible, appropriate internal storage provision, and access to usable outdoor amenity space. The policy is supported by Table 3.1, which sets out minimum internal space standards for new residential development, and Table 3.2, which identifies qualitative design criteria that should be met. These requirements are reinforced at the local level by Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design), which requires development to

provide a high standard of amenity for future occupiers through well-designed internal layouts, sufficient light and outlook, and accommodation that is fit for purpose.

The proposed development is described by the applicant as a two-bedroom dwelling intended to accommodate two persons. However, London Plan Policy D6 identifies two-bedroom dwellings as typically accommodating three to four persons, with minimum internal floor area standards of 70 sqm for a two-person, two-storey dwelling and 79 sqm for a four-person unit.

The proposed scheme would provide approximately 41 sqm of gross internal area (GIA) at ground-floor level and 24 sqm at first-floor level, resulting in a total internal area of approximately 65 sqm. Both bedrooms measure approximately 11 sqm, with areas identified as storage.

Officers are sceptical that the proposed dwelling would realistically function as a two-person unit. The submitted plans show two separate bedrooms, and in accordance with the London Plan, an assumed occupancy of three to four persons is considered more realistic. Regardless of the stated occupancy, the proposed dwelling would fall below the minimum internal space standards required for a two-storey dwelling. As such, the development fails to meet the quantitative requirements of London Plan Policy D6.

In terms of environmental quality, the proposed development includes large windows to the front elevations, which would allow reasonable levels of daylight to the front-facing bedroom and the first-floor open-plan living/kitchen area. However, significant concerns arise in relation to the rear bedroom. This room would rely on a small internal courtyard of approximately 2.8 sqm as its principal source of daylight and outlook. The courtyard is only approximately 2 metres in depth and faces towards the front bedroom, limiting its effectiveness as a meaningful lightwell.

While the front-facing bedroom and first-floor living area are considered capable of achieving an acceptable standard of daylight and outlook, officers have serious concerns regarding the rear bedroom. A single door-window located on one side of the room would be insufficient to provide adequate natural light to the full depth of the space. This situation is further exacerbated by the proximity of No. 3 Church Road and the proposed first-floor element, both of which would lie within the southern sun path. Given that the rear bedroom is located on the southern side of the site, this arrangement would materially restrict sunlight penetration.

It is therefore not considered that reliance on a very limited courtyard accessed by a single door-window would provide an acceptable standard of daylight, outlook or overall residential amenity for a habitable room. As a result, the proposed

development fails to provide an adequate standard of internal living accommodation and would not deliver a high-quality residential environment.

The proposal is therefore contrary to London Plan Policy D6 and Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD, which seek to secure high-quality, functional and well-lit accommodation for future occupiers, and this forms a further reason for refusal.

Impact on Neighbourhood Amenity

London Plan Policy D6 requires development to safeguard the amenity of surrounding occupiers, including by ensuring appropriate levels of daylight and sunlight and minimising overshadowing. Policy DM1 (Delivering High Quality Design) further requires development proposals to deliver a high standard of amenity for both future users and neighbouring occupiers, including adequate outlook, privacy and avoidance of overbearing impacts. These requirements are reinforced by Policy DM7, which applies specifically to infill, backland and garden-land development and requires that such proposals do not result in harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties, including through loss of outlook, enclosure or dominance.

While a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been submitted, it does not include a full quantitative or qualitative assessment undertaken in accordance with the BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight guidance. In the absence of a robust BRE-compliant assessment, officers are not satisfied that the impacts of the proposal on neighbouring properties have been adequately demonstrated or mitigated, particularly given the constrained nature of the site and its relationship with surrounding dwellings.

During the pre-application process, officers identified that the originally proposed sloping roof form was intended to reduce impacts on the garden of No. 56 Talbot Road. However, it was concluded at that time that, notwithstanding this design approach, the construction of a new two-storey building on this site would still erode the sense of openness and adversely affect outlook from neighbouring rear-facing habitable rooms. These concerns remain applicable to the current proposal.

The proposed dwelling would be positioned in very close proximity to the rear-facing windows of an existing two-bedroom ground-floor flat at No. 1 Church Road, approved under planning permission reference HGY/2016/3651. Given the minimal separation distance, the scale and height of the development would result in a strong sense of enclosure and would appear significantly overbearing when viewed from these windows, leading to an unacceptable loss of outlook and daylight. This impact is compounded by the proposal's siting hard up against site boundaries, contrary to the requirements of Policy DM7.

In addition, the development would result in the loss of garden space originally allocated to this flat when permission was granted for its conversion into self-contained units. The cumulative impact of reduced private amenity space, loss of outlook, and the overbearing presence of the proposed building would materially worsen living conditions for the occupiers.

In relation to No.56 Talbot Road, the proposed building would introduce additional built form directly on the boundary with a property that already benefits from only a modest rear garden, further constrained by the presence of the flatted block at Nos.3–5 Church Road to the rear. In this context, the proposal would exacerbate an existing sense of enclosure and create a dominant and oppressive impact on the garden environment, even if direct sunlight losses are limited. This outcome is inconsistent with Policy DM7, which seeks to prevent backland development from intensifying constrained plots to the detriment of neighbouring amenity.

Although no additional overlooking would arise due to the absence of flank windows, the harm identified is not limited to privacy impacts. The proximity, scale and massing of the development would create an unacceptably dominant and overbearing presence that would adversely affect outlook, spatial quality and the perception of openness for neighbouring occupiers.

For these reasons, the proposed development would result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. In particular, the siting, scale and massing of the development would lead to adverse impacts on the conditions of daylight and sunlight, create an overbearing and dominant presence, and give rise to an increased sense of enclosure. The development would therefore fail to provide an acceptable standard of amenity and is contrary to London Plan Policy D6 and Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Haringey Development Management DPD.

Energy & Sustainability (including Biodiversity Net Gain)

Local Plan Policy SP4 seeks to reduce carbon emissions and energy use from new development through design, construction and occupation, and requires new residential development to achieve zero-carbon standards. This approach is supported by Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD, which requires new development to incorporate sustainable design, layout and construction techniques, apply the energy and cooling hierarchies, and use materials with high environmental performance. London Plan Policy SI4 further requires measures to minimise the urban heat island effect through appropriate design, layout, orientation, materials and the incorporation of green infrastructure.

In order to demonstrate compliance with these policies, planning applications for new residential development are expected to be supported by an Energy Statement that clearly sets out, as a minimum:

- baseline regulated and unregulated carbon emissions;
- assumptions used within the baseline model;
- Target Emission Rate (TER) and Dwelling Emission Rate (DER);
- the reduction in emissions achieved through the energy hierarchy (Be Lean, Be Clean, Be Green); and
- SAP outputs for the proposed dwelling at each stage of the energy hierarchy.

While the proposal includes a green roof, no Energy Statement has been submitted.

In the absence of this information, it has not been demonstrated that the development would achieve the required reductions in carbon emissions or comply with the relevant local and strategic energy and sustainability policies.

In addition, the development does not address wider sustainability considerations.

The proposed dwelling would be single-aspect, with habitable room windows facing predominantly northwards. While emerging policy shows some flexibility in relation to dual-aspect dwellings, London Plan Policy D6 continues to expect dual-aspect accommodation where possible, particularly for family housing. No information has been submitted to demonstrate how adequate ventilation would be achieved for a single-aspect dwelling, as required by Part C of London Plan Policy D6. Policy D3 of the London Plan requires development to optimise site capacity while achieving high standards of sustainability, which has not been demonstrated in this case.

With regard to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), mandatory BNG requirements apply to qualifying development under Schedule 7A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The applicant has indicated that the proposal is exempt from BNG on the basis that it is de minimis development; however, no supporting evidence or biodiversity information has been submitted to substantiate this claim. Given that the proposal would result in the loss of garden land and the site lies within an established residential area, sufficient information has not been provided to demonstrate that the development would either be exempt from, or comply with, the statutory BNG requirements.

In the absence of an Energy Statement, information demonstrating acceptable ventilation and environmental performance, and evidence to justify exemption from or compliance with mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, the proposed development fails to demonstrate that it meets the required standards of sustainability.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Local Plan Policy SP4, Policies DM21 and DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD, and London Plan Policies D3, D6 and SI4.

Parking & Transport

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 appropriately mitigated. Policies T4, T5, and T6 set out key principles for assessing development impacts on the highway network, including trip generation, parking demand, and cycle provision. Local Plan Policy SP7 (2017) seeks to address climate change, improve place shaping and the public realm, and enhance environmental and transport quality and safety by promoting public transport, walking, and cycling. The policy also aims to locate major trip-generating developments in areas with good access to public transport. This approach is supported by Development Management Policy DM31 'Sustainable Transport' (2017).

The application site is located within a PTAL 4 area, indicating slightly above-average accessibility to public transport. The Design and Access Statement submitted by the applicant confirms that the proposed development would be car-free, with two Sheffield cycle stands provided within the front patio area.

The application is accompanied by a Construction Management Plan. Were the application acceptable in other respects, a condition would be required to secure the submission of an up-to-date Construction Management Plan prior to commencement of development, to ensure that transport impacts on the surrounding area are minimised during the construction phase.

Given that the proposal is car-free and provides two Sheffield cycle stands for a two-person dwelling, the development is considered to comply with the relevant standards of Policy DM13 and the London Plan and is acceptable in transport terms. Were the application acceptable in other respects, a condition would be imposed requiring the cycle parking to be installed prior to first occupation of the dwelling.

Waste Management

DM DPD Policy DM4 requires proposals to sustainably manage waste arising during design, construction and occupation. Developments should provide on-site facilities for general waste, recyclables and organic material, with adequate internal and external storage and safe, accessible arrangements for occupiers and collection operatives. Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policy DH8 further requires that waste and

recycling facilities in new buildings are well-designed and discreetly integrated into the overall scheme.

Two wheelie bins are located at the front of the property. This is considered to be sufficient waste storage for the proposed dwelling and is acceptable in this regard.

Impact on Trees

London Plan Policy G7 mandates the retention of existing trees of value, with any necessary removal requiring adequate replacement. The policy further emphasizes the inclusion of new tree plantings, particularly those with large canopies, within development proposals. DM Policy (2017) DM1, 'Delivering High-Quality Design,' expects development proposals to appropriately respond to the presence of trees both on and near the site. Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Policies SO4.4 and OS2 also emphasise the protection of trees and vegetation as integral to Highgate's green character

The proposed development would necessitate the removal of some trees within the void area, which are protected by virtue of their location within a conservation area. LBH Arboriculture officers have been consulted and consider the proposed development to be acceptable in this regard, subject to the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Were the application acceptable in other respects, a condition would be imposed requiring full compliance with the submitted Arboricultural Assessment and any associated tree protection and replacement measures.

Conclusion

While the proposed development would deliver a single unit of accommodation within a generally sustainable location, the site is too constrained and limited in size to accommodate a dwelling of the scale and form proposed without giving rise to unacceptable harm. The ability to deliver housing on small sites is not unconditional and must be balanced against site-specific constraints and impacts.

In this case, the proposal fails to respond appropriately to the sensitive context of the Highgate Conservation Area. The siting, scale, massing and architectural approach would result in a visually prominent and incongruous form of backland development that would erode openness, spatial character and established townscape qualities. The limited public benefit arising from the provision of a single dwelling does not outweigh the identified heritage harm.

The development would also provide an unacceptable standard of residential accommodation, failing to meet minimum internal space standards and to deliver

adequate levels of daylight, sunlight and outlook to all habitable rooms. In addition, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity through overbearing impacts, an increased sense of enclosure, and adverse effects on daylight and sunlight.

Furthermore, the scheme fails to demonstrate compliance with energy and sustainability requirements.

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

7. CIL Applicable

Were this development to be recommended for refusal such a scheme would be liable for CIL if subsequently approved.

8. Recommendation

It is therefore recommended that this application be Refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale, massing and form, would result in an unduly prominent and incongruous form of backland and infill development that would erode the openness, spatial qualities and established character to this part of Church Road and this part of the Highgate Conservation Area, in turn failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to London Plan Policies D3 and HC1 (2021), Haringey Local Plan Policy SP12, Policies DM1, DM7 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD, and Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan.
2. The proposed development would fail to provide an acceptable standard of residential accommodation by reason of its inadequate internal floor area, failure to meet minimum internal space standards, lack of dual-aspect accommodation, and insufficient provision of daylight and outlook to a habitable room. The proposal also fails to demonstrate that acceptable levels of ventilation could be achieved for a single-aspect dwelling. As such, the development would not deliver a high-quality living environment for future occupiers contrary to London Plan Policy D6 (2021) and Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD.

3. The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale and massing, would result in unacceptable harm to the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in particular through adverse impacts on conditions of daylight and sunlight, an overbearing and dominant presence, and an increased sense of enclosure. The proposal would therefore fail to provide an acceptable standard of amenity, contrary to London Plan Policy D6 and Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Haringey Development Management DPD.
4. No Energy Statement has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would adequately reduce carbon emissions, minimise energy use, or comply with the energy hierarchy as required for new residential development. In the absence of this information, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would achieve the required environmental performance or meet zero-carbon and sustainability objectives. The development is therefore contrary to Policy SP4 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policy DM21 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).