

Boama Daniel

From: Dominic Dear [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 May 2026 17:17
To: Boama Daniel
Cc: Richard Taube
Subject: RE: Palm Court and Lionel House - HGY/2026/0574 & HGY/2026/0573

Hi Daniel,

Just hopping in here on behalf of my client.

Thank you for sharing the neighbour representations received in connection with the above applications.

We have reviewed the objections carefully and are happy to provide the following observations to assist with your assessment.

We have addressed each ground of objection in turn below, and have cross-referenced the findings from the earlier delegated reports where relevant, given that the current proposals are identical in all material respects to those previously approved under HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453.

Preliminary Observation — Previously Consented Identical Schemes

The current applications are, in all material respects, identical to those previously assessed, consulted upon, and approved by Haringey Council under delegated authority in June 2023, under case references HGY/2022/4426 (Lionel House, Palmerston Road, N22 8QN) and HGY/2022/4453 (Palm Court, Palmerston Road, N22 8QL), both assessed by Case Officer Daniel Kwasi. Both applications were for the erection of one additional storey under Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), to provide self-contained flats with balconies above the existing blocks — precisely the proposal now before the Council.

In granting prior approval on both occasions, the Council necessarily found all relevant planning considerations to be acceptable. The current objections raise no new material considerations that were not already before the Council at that time. We address each ground of objection in turn below.

1. Noise and Disturbance — Residential Occupation

Objectors raise concerns regarding noise transmission from additional residential occupation, including footsteps, doors, balcony use, and amplified sound.

This matter was explicitly assessed under the amenity heading of both delegated officer reports (HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453). In both cases, the Council's officer concluded in identical terms: "The proposed floor to ceiling dimension is appropriate for residential use and the increased massing will have limited impact on neighbouring properties in terms of daylight, visual amenity or privacy. Therefore, there would be no unacceptable effect on amenity, with regard to the living conditions of the existing occupiers of the application site building or the occupiers of neighbouring properties."

This finding applies with equal force to the current applications. The development is unchanged. Residential noise associated with normal occupation of flats is not a material planning consideration that could justify refusal of an otherwise identical scheme to one already found acceptable by this Council.

2. Construction Noise, Disruption and Traffic Management

Objectors raise concerns regarding construction-phase noise, vehicle movements, parking pressure on Palmerston Road, and access via the narrow driveway between Maxwell House and Lawrence House.

These matters were fully addressed in both previous delegated officer reports. The Council's Transportation team was consulted on both applications. As recorded in the officer reports for HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453: "Transportation commented on the previous application and stated that there were no particular transport issues identified with the proposal."

Critically, both consents include an identically worded Condition 5, which requires that no development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Method of Construction Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. That statement must include:

a) Parking and management of vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors b) Loading and unloading of plant and materials c) Storage of plant and materials d) Programme of works including measures for traffic management e) Provision of boundary hoarding behind any visibility zones f) Wheel washing facilities

The reason given for this condition in both consented reports was: "To ensure there are no adverse impacts on the free flow of traffic on local roads and to safeguard the amenities of the area consistent with Policies T4, T7 and D14 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP0 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and with Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017."

This condition is proposed again on the current applications. The concerns raised by objectors regarding construction vehicles, access, and highway safety are precisely the matters this condition is designed to address. The Council has already determined, twice, that these matters are capable of being satisfactorily managed through this mechanism.

3. Structural Integrity and Safety

Objectors assert that the addition of a further storey will place unacceptable loads on the existing structure and foundations, potentially causing cracking, movement, and safety risks during construction.

Structural matters are not assessed as part of the prior approval process — they fall to be addressed through the Building Regulations and Building Control process, as the Council's own Building Control team made clear in both previous applications. In the consultation responses recorded in HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453, LBH Building Control stated: "The submitted details are sufficient for the purposes of Planning Approval. This office has no objection to this planning application. A formal detailed assessment will be undertaken for fire safety at the Building Control stage."

Structural matters therefore fall outside the scope of the prior approval assessment. A structural engineer has confirmed adequate residual capacity for the additional storey, and all detailed structural matters will be assessed at Building Regulations stage in the usual way.

4. Daylight and Sunlight — Impact on Existing and Neighbouring Residents

Objectors, including the resident of 16 Maxwell House in their letter dated 30 March 2026, raise concerns about loss of light to properties on the eastern side of Palmerston Road.

This was a central consideration in both previous prior approval assessments under HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453. A Daylight and Sunlight Review was submitted with the previous applications and

assessed by the Council's officers. Both delegated reports record the following conclusion: "The Daylight and Sunlight Review submitted on 24 November 2022 states that the proposal will have a reduced implication on the neighbours' daylight and sunlight and the conclusions within their report dated 8 December 2021 (under the refused scheme) will therefore remain the same, in that the BRE guidelines are achieved and the proposal will not have a significant effect on their daylight and sunlight."

Both reports also confirmed: "The revised proposed accommodation will achieve the BRE guidelines (2022) and provide accommodation which will have good access to daylight and sunlight."

As the scheme is identical, the Daylight and Sunlight Review conclusions remain equally applicable. The BRE guidelines are met and there is no material basis to revisit this finding.

5. Balconies and Natural Light to Existing Flats

The resident of 16 Maxwell House also objects that balconies will restrict natural light to existing flats in Lionel House.

The inclusion of balconies was explicitly part of both consented schemes under HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453, and was considered as part of the amenity and design assessment. The officer reports noted that balconies form part of the design approach that helped achieve an acceptable form of development following the earlier refusals for two-storey extensions without appropriate setbacks. Their inclusion was considered acceptable in design and amenity terms, and that conclusion is not disturbed by the current applications.

6. Refuse and Waste Storage

Objectors raise concerns about the adequacy of bin storage and the absence of food waste recycling provision.

Refuse storage is secured by Condition 3 of both previous consents (HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453), in identical terms requiring that: "No development shall take place until a detailed scheme for the provision of refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such a scheme as approved shall be implemented and permanently retained thereafter."

This condition is carried forward to the current applications. The Council's own reason for this condition in both reports was: "In order to protect the amenities of the locality and to comply with Policy DM4 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policy 5.17 of the London Plan 2021." The matter is therefore already addressed through the established pre-commencement condition process.

7. Cycle Storage

Objectors raise concerns that cycle storage as shown serves only the new flats rather than the wider building.

Cycle storage for the new dwellings is secured by Condition 4 of both previous consents, requiring a minimum of 3 cycle parking spaces in accordance with the London Cycling Design Standards, to be submitted and approved prior to commencement above ground. The Council found this approach acceptable in both HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453 and there is no basis to depart from that position.

8. Parking — Existing Spaces and Permit Pressure

Objectors raise concerns about new residents accessing existing parking at the front of the block and applying for permits on Palmerston Road.

As noted in both previous delegated officer reports, Transportation confirmed there were no particular transport issues with the proposal. The site has a PTAL value of 3, with Bowes Park station within 5 to 10 minutes' walk and 6 bus services accessible within the same distance. Parking management and permit eligibility are matters of highway authority policy and are not capable of being controlled through conditions attached to a prior approval application of this nature. The Council made no parking restriction conditions in either of its previous consents, and there is no justification for a different approach now.

9. Communal Areas and Shared Facilities

Objectors suggest the development should be conditioned to require improvements to communal areas, stairwells, and shared spaces.

Under the prior approval regime applicable to this type of development (Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A of the GPDO 2015 as amended), the Council's assessment is limited to the prescribed matters set out in Class A, paragraph A.2. The imposition of conditions requiring general improvements to existing communal areas falls outside the scope of what can be secured through prior approval conditions and would not be a lawful or proportionate requirement. The Council reached this same conclusion in granting both HGY/2022/4426 and HGY/2022/4453 without imposing any such requirement.

10. Lift Provision

The resident of 16 Maxwell House queries whether new residents will be willing to ascend four flights of stairs without a lift.

The provision or otherwise of a lift is a matter for the developer and future occupiers and does not constitute a material planning consideration. It was not raised as a reason for refusal in either previous consent and there is no basis for it to be treated differently now.

11. Conditions from the Earlier Approvals and Deliverability of the Current Scheme

11.1 The earlier approvals included a suite of pre-commencement conditions that were consistent across both schemes. These included:

Condition 2: Detailed drawings and sections confirming the detailed design and materials, including elevational treatment, parapet detailing, windows and doors at 1:10, balustrading, bronze effect metal cladding sample panels, and details of cycle and refuse enclosures and plant room, together with a full schedule of product references.

Condition 3: A detailed scheme for refuse and waste storage and recycling facilities.

Condition 4: Details of secure and covered cycle parking facilities, with a minimum of 3 spaces to be provided in accordance with the London Cycling Design Standards, with implementation prior to occupation.

Condition 5: A Method of Construction Statement, including parking and management of vehicles, loading and unloading, storage of materials, programme of works and traffic management measures, boundary hoarding, and wheel washing facilities.

11.2 While these conditions would ordinarily be dealt with via discharge of condition submissions prior to commencement, the resubmitted applications are supported by the relevant details to demonstrate, clearly and comprehensively, that the scheme remains deliverable and capable of being implemented fully in accordance with the requirements of the earlier permissions.

Conclusion

We hope the above is helpful and that it provides a clear picture of how each of the concerns raised has already been considered and addressed through the previous approval process. Given that the schemes are identical and that the Council's own officers assessed all of these issues thoroughly in June 2023 — consulting the relevant technical teams and concluding that both proposals were acceptable — we would respectfully suggest that the same conclusions can confidently be reached on the current applications.

We are of course very happy to provide any further information or clarification that would assist with your determination, and please do not hesitate to get in touch if anything would be helpful.

Yours sincerely,

Dom

From: Boama Daniel [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 May 2026 12:32
To: Richard Taube [REDACTED]
Cc: Dominic Dear [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Palm Court and Lionel House - HGY/2026/0574 & HGY/2026/0573

Dear Richard,

Re: HGY/2026/0574 – Lionel House, Palmerston Road, Wood Green, London, N22 8QN

Please can you provide a response to the following comments:

Objection 1

Please see attached "Written Comments 001".

Objection 2

I object to the proposed development of three flats on top of Lionel House. However, I understand that under current legislation Haringey Council is able to approve this development and the proposed development of Palm Court. Please consider the following points.

Within the papers Haringey Council reference that "no development shall take place, until a Method of Construction Statement...have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority". There is no evidence of this having been submitted and published. Residents would welcome seeing and being able to comment on this as we anticipate the development works will have a significant impact on residents. I am particularly concerned about access to the building, vehicles and waste handling.

[Upspace] we would expect the same conditions as per the currently consented scheme which includes for a method of construction statement

Bike storage _ Condition 4 document shows a diagram for storage of three bikes. During consultation with residents UPSPACE described this as being an asset for existing residents as well as new residents. The design suggests that this will just be for new residents - 3 bikes / 3 flats. I ask that the Council require the bike storage meets the needs of all of Lionel House and that the size of bike storage is agreed with Leaseholders.

[Upspace] proposal is for new units only this is due to the fact that any maintenance of additional communal assets are not recoverable under the service charge and hence we as the landlord of the new units would be liable for its maintenance in perpetuity

Application form, Vehicle parking section states that there is no parking. There is parking for up to three cars at the front of the block. Residents would welcome that it is stipulated that the new residents will not have access / rights to this parking.

[Upspace] this is land that is part of the freehold and hence any restrictions should not form part of the planning application

Haringey Council will need to determine whether residents of these new dwellings can apply for parking permits for Palmerston Road. As referenced in comments by a resident of Palmerston Road, this will put additional pressure on already limited spaces.

[Upspace] no parking restriction was proposed in the currently consented scheme and hence we see no reason why there will be one for new consents

The application form states tenure as market for sale. Residents were previously told by UPSPACE that the new flats would not be put up for sale and would instead be retained by UPSPACE and rented out. They assured residents that they do so in order to show their commitment to the block beyond the development. It would be helpful if the Council can clarify UPSPACE's intentions.

[Upspace] this is a business strategy point which you can appreciate can lead to changes in line with market conditions.

Bin storage - Design needs to be amended in line with the number of bins the block has. I'd also like to see food waste recycling to be included.

[Upspace] as per currently consented scheme there is a waste storage detail condition

Objection 2

I wish to object to the proposal for new dwellinghouses on a detached block of flats due to the likely adverse impact on the living conditions of existing residents and neighbouring properties, particularly in relation to disturbance, noise, and general amenity.

Noise Nuisance

The creation of three additional flats on a new upper floor would significantly increase noise levels within and around the building. This includes everyday residential noise such as footsteps, movement across floors, opening and closing of doors, use of balconies, and amplified sound from televisions or music. Noise transmission is likely to be exacerbated by the vertical extension, particularly where existing structures were not originally designed to accommodate further storeys. This would materially harm the quiet enjoyment of nearby dwellings, especially during early mornings, evenings, and night-time hours.

[Upspace] due to the construction build-up the noise transfer will be minimal

In addition, construction works associated with adding an extra floor would introduce prolonged periods of disruptive noise from heavy machinery, drilling, and lifting operations, causing disturbance to residents over an extended duration.

General Disturbance and Intensification of Use

The proposal would lead to an intensified use of the site, increasing day-to-day activity within a previously established residential environment. Additional occupants would increase levels of movement in communal areas, stairwells, entrances, and shared access points, resulting in a more congested and disturbed living environment for existing residents.

Odour and Environmental Disturbance

An increase in the number of dwellings would likely result in greater generation of domestic odours from cooking, refuse storage, and waste disposal.

[Upspace] additional refuse if proposed

Without adequate mitigation, this could lead to unpleasant smells affecting nearby flats and outdoor amenity areas. Increased refuse volumes also raise concerns regarding storage capacity, collection frequency, and potential odour and hygiene issues if bins overflow or are improperly managed.

In addition the proposed construction of additional flats above the existing building raises serious concerns regarding the potential impact on the structural integrity

[Upspace] structural engineer has confirmed adequate residual capacity for the additional storey

, safety, and condition of the existing flats, as well as the overall appearance of the building.

Structural Movement, Cracks and Damage

Adding an additional storey to an existing block will place increased loads on the current structure and foundations. There is a clear risk that this could result in structural movement, leading to cracking in walls, ceilings, floors, and communal areas, particularly within the upper-level flats directly below the proposed works.

The construction process itself would involve significant disruption, including vibration from structural works, drilling, lifting operations, and the installation of new structural elements. These activities pose a risk not only of physical damage to existing flats, but also of safety concerns for residents, particularly where works are carried out directly above occupied homes.

There is also concern regarding how resident safety would be maintained during construction, including protection from falling debris, dust ingress, temporary removal of weatherproofing, and safe access through shared entrances and stairwells.

The construction of the proposed new flats is likely to have a significant and detrimental impact on parking availability and the management of vehicles associated with site personnel, operatives, and visitors.

During the construction phase, the development would generate frequent vehicle movements, including contractor vans, delivery lorries, skip collections, and visits by site personnel. The site does not appear to have sufficient on-site space to accommodate these vehicles, meaning they are likely to park on surrounding residential streets. This would increase competition for already limited parking spaces, to the detriment of existing residents and neighbouring properties.

Unregulated or poorly managed construction parking could result in obstruction of access routes, blocked driveways, and reduced visibility for pedestrians and other road users. This raises concerns regarding highway safety, particularly for emergency vehicles, refuse collection, and vulnerable users such as children and older residents.

The proposal does not appear to include any clear commitment to improving or upgrading the existing communal areas of the block, despite the introduction of additional dwellinghouses and residents.

[Upspace] note we are discussing improvements direct with residents as we speak

The development would increase pressure on shared facilities such as entrances, stairwells, circulation areas, refuse and recycling storage, and any shared external spaces. These areas are already used by current residents and were designed to serve the existing number of flats. The addition of further units will inevitably intensify use, leading to increased congestion, wear and tear, and a decline in the quality and usability of communal spaces.

There is no indication that the applicant intends to enhance lighting, accessibility, storage provision, maintenance arrangements, or general layout of communal areas to accommodate the increased occupancy. Without such improvements, the development would place additional strain on shared spaces and negatively affect safety, comfort, and day-to-day living conditions for existing residents. In particular, the absence of information on improvements to refuse and recycling facilities is concerning. Additional households will generate more waste, and without expanded or better-managed communal refuse areas, this is likely to lead to overcrowding, odour problems, and reduced cleanliness in shared parts of the building.

The proposed development for new dwellinghouses on a detached block of flats would result in unacceptable impacts on existing residents and the building as a whole. It would intensify use without

adequate mitigation, leading to increased noise, disturbance, pressure on communal areas, parking congestion, and disruption during construction.

Concerns remain regarding structural safety, potential damage to existing flats, and the lack of clear construction and site management measures. The proposal also fails to provide improvements to communal facilities to offset the additional dwellings and risks harming the building's appearance and residential amenity.

For these reasons, the proposal should not be supported in its current form.

I look forward to your response.

Kind regards

Daniel

Daniel Boama

Planning Officer

Placemaking and Housing | Haringey Council

River Park House 225 High Road | London | N22 8HQ

Email: [REDACTED]

Mob: [REDACTED]

[Welcome to Haringey Council | Haringey Council](#)

[Planning and building control | Haringey Council](#)

