

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0601
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	102 Mannock Road, Tottenham, London, N22 6AA
Proposal:	Retention of large boundary wall surrounding property, retention of single storey side/rear extension, retention of extensions and internal alterations to garage structure, proposed alterations to the existing pitch roof and extension to the main roof to convert the existing attic to a new loft room, insertion of 5 rooflights to front, side and rear elevation, erection of front porch, conversion from dwelling into two self-contained flats.
Case Officer:	Roland Sheldon
Valid Date:	14/05/2026
	6
Applicant:	Mr Sze Keung HO
Agent:	Mr Gavin Fung

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Site location

The subject site contains a two-storey end-of-terrace dwellinghouse located on the southern side of Mannock Road, N22. The surrounding uses are residential. The site does not contain a listed building and is not located within a conservation area.

2. Description of Proposal

Retention of large boundary wall surrounding property, retention of single storey side/rear extension, retention of extensions and internal alterations to garage structure, proposed alterations to the existing pitch roof and extension to the main roof to convert the existing attic to a new loft room, insertion of 5 rooflights to front, side and rear elevation, proposed erection of front porch, conversion from dwelling into two self-contained flats.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

Planning history

HGY/2025/0513: Alterations to the existing pitch roof and extension to the main roof to convert the existing attic to a new loft room of dwellinghouse, insertion of 5 rooflights to front, side and rear elevation – Approved 23/05/2025

Planning enforcement history

ENF/2024/0582: Untidy land – ongoing investigation

4. Internal & Statutory Consultation

The following were consulted regarding the application:

LBH Transportation: No objections to the proposal. Secure, sheltered cycle parking provision details should be provided by condition.

LBH Climate Action: Insufficient information has been provided to allow officers to determine if they can support the application.

LBH Street Cleansing: No comments made

5. Local Representations

The application was advertised through letters sent to neighbouring properties. 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: 0

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. Energy/sustainability;
6. Transport considerations;
7. Biodiversity/landscaping;
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.

The proposal would add an additional residential unit to the borough's housing stock through conversion of an existing dwelling into 2 self-contained flats, which would work towards meeting the above identified housing delivery objectives for the borough. The principle of additional housing is therefore acceptable.

Conversion

DM policy DM16 sets out criteria that must be applied to proposals for conversion of larger homes to small self-contained units in the borough. Where a dwelling is located within the Family Housing Protection Zone, it must have an un-extended original floorspace of 120m² and not result in a net loss of family-sized (3 bedroom plus) units. Given the unique plot on which the dwelling is located, it is difficult to clarify its original un-extended floorspace. From reviewing historic OS maps from 1938, it appears that the two-storey side projection may be an original feature. If so, the original un-extended floorspace is estimated to be 140m² which would comfortably exceed the 120m² requirement.

The proposal would provide a 3-bedroom unit in the first floor/loft space. As such, the proposal would comply with part A.b and B of policy DM16. The assessment of the standard of accommodation forms a separate part of the assessment, but in terms of land use, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

Design and character

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.

Boundary wall

The existing rear wall would be increased in height across pretty much the full expanse of the rear elevation of the site. The pre-existing wall was staggered in height with a much lower rear wall at the north-western end than as built, which now reaches up to 2.7 metres.

The existing front wall has also been slightly increased in height along the frontage of the dwelling, but a significant increased height has been made to the south-east section of the frontage boundary wall, although there is no pre-existing elevation that appears to accurately show its previous height.

The replacement brick wall is composed of a light coloured tone, with red horizontal banding, and a stone coping.

It is understandable that the building was exposed and perhaps needed a more robust boundary treatment for security purposes. However, the wall as built is excessive in scale, and has an

unacceptably visually dominant impact. The height and expanse of the wall is uncharacteristic and has a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the locality and wider street scene. As such, the boundary wall as built is unacceptable with regards to design and character considerations.

Single storey side/rear extension

A triangular shaped single storey structure that is affixed to the rear wall of the building has been constructed, with its southern wall forming part of the rear boundary wall of the site. It is labelled as an outbuilding on the submitted plans.

The extension contributes to the over-development of the site from the cumulative extensions and alterations made, and visual dominance of the boundary treatment. There is no fall-back position in terms of permitted development rights in that it is both a side and rear extension and would exceed 3 metres in depth overall. The proposed extension is unacceptable with regards to design/character considerations.

Extensions/alterations to garage structure

The footprint of the garage stay the same, but the boundary walls have been replaced as part of the replacement boundary wall works and increased in height. As such, the concerns with regards to the boundary wall impact on the character and appearance of the host building and locality are applicable.

Front porch

The front porch is 3.5 metres width x 1.125 metres depth, with an eaves height of 2.6 metres and maximum height of 3.3 metres. It is shown as being externally clad in brick to match the existing dwelling with roof tiles to match. The proposed porch would be considered to be acceptable with regards to design considerations

Roof extension and 5 rooflights

The proposal seeks to erect a small increase in the width expanse of the ridge of the roof of the dwelling with a resultant alteration to the pitch angle of the side hip of the roof. The rear projecting gable would also be marginally increased in height, but still set below the main ridge height. The works are proposed to facilitate the creation of an additional ensuite bedroom in the loft space.

The proposed roof extensions would be modest in scale and would respect the scale, form and character of the host building and wider locality. There are no concerns with regards to the rooflights with regards to design and character. The proposed roof extension is therefore acceptable with regards to design and character considerations.

However, on the basis of the boundary wall/garage extension and single storey rear extension, the proposal would be unacceptable with regards to design and character considerations.

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 criteria set out within parts c-g of part A of DMP policy DM16 largely echo some of the design aspects covered within policy D6 of the London Plan.

The proposal would see the property converted into 2 self-contained flats, with a 2-bedroom 3-person dwelling on the ground floor, and a 3-bedroom, 5-person dwelling located on the first and second floors.

The ground floor flat would have an internal floorspace of 66.25m² which exceeds the 61m² required to meet London Plan floorspace standards. Both bedrooms would meet minimum floorspace standards and all habitable rooms would benefit from satisfactory outlook and light. The 27m² rear garden area would be available for use by future occupants of the ground floor flat which comfortably exceeds minimum London Plan standards.

All of the ground floor would have floor-to-ceiling heights of 2.675 metres which exceeds the 2.5 metres required for 75% of the floorspace for new residential units.

The upper floor flat would be located over the first and loft floors and would provide a 3-bedroom 5-person unit. The unit would have an internal floorspace of 89m², which is below the minimum London Plan floorspace standards for a 3b-5p unit over 2 floors of 93m². One of the bedrooms has a floorspace of 6m² which is below the London Plan minimum floorspace standard of 7.5m² for a single bedroom.

Limited outlook would be provided for the loft bedroom through high level roof lights. No daylight/sunlight report has been submitted, but with the inclusion of the 4 rooflights, it is considered that the loft bedroom would be likely to benefit from adequate daylighting conditions.

The submission has omitted floor plans which show the floor-to-ceiling heights, but it appears that at least 10.25m² of the loft bedroom is below 2.3 metres, and it would appear from viewing elevations against floor plans, that the vast majority of the loft area would be well below 2.5 and 2.3 metres, aside from a small section adjacent to the ridge of the roof.

No amenity space provided for upper floor flat which is the family-sized unit. This is a sub-standard arrangement.

On the basis of the above, the proposal would provide a cramped, sub-standard form of accommodation for future occupants of the upper floor family-sized unit, and would fail to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation for future occupants of the development.

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.

Single storey side/rear extension / outbuilding

The outbuilding/single storey extension spans the full 6.7 metre depth along the boundary shared with neighbouring no. 100 Mannock Road and has a height of 2.7 metres with a flat roof.

Neighbouring no. 100 Mannock Road has an existing single storey rear canopy of approximately 2 metres.

It appears that there was previously a boundary fence that ran along this shared boundary of much lower height. Given the existence of the rear canopy beyond the extent of the ground floor rear elevation, the extension is unlikely to have resulted in an unacceptable loss of outlook or light conditions for the occupants of no. 100. However, by virtue of the increased height of the boundary wall, the extension does materially enclose the short rear garden space of no. 100 Mannock Road, to the detriment of the enjoyment of the use of this rear garden amenity space.

The other extensions and alterations to the building are not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity. However, on the basis of the enclosing impact of the increased height of boundary wall, the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupants of no. 100 Mannock Road. The proposed development is therefore unacceptable with regards to amenity impact considerations.

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 submission, a sustainability statement has been submitted which has been reviewed by Climate Change Officers. They have highlighted that insufficient information has been provided to make an informed assessment of the energy and sustainability performance of the development. Incomplete information regarding carbon reductions, a lack of clarity regarding whether the energy modelling has been based on a refurbishment, and an absence of a GLA emissions reporting sheet have been raised as issues.

In addition to this, the proposal does not comply with the policy SP4 requirement for at least 20% of carbon dioxide reductions to be achieved by on site renewable energy, with no information provided on the proposed heating system. Overall, the proposal fails to meet the requirements of policy SP4 or DM21 and is unacceptable from an energy and sustainability perspective.

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 (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 in an area with a public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 6a which is excellent, and is located within a CPZ. Given the excellent PTAL value and only one 2-bedroom unit is being added to the site, it is not envisaged that the proposal would significant pressure on local parking stress.

Details of cycle parking storage have not been provided but could be secured by condition if the development was to be recommended for approval. Subject to compliance with such a condition, the proposal would be acceptable with regards to highways and transportation considerations.

Biodiversity/landscaping

The NPPF outlines that planning decisions should minimise impacts on and provide net gains for biodiversity. London Plan policy G6 sets out that development proposals should manage impacts on biodiversity and aim to secure biodiversity net gain. Part A (c) of DM policy DM21 reiterates this commitment to maximise opportunities to enhance biodiversity on-site. The introduction of the Environment Act 2021 post April 2024 now requires planning proposals on small sites to provide a 10% net gain in biodiversity value.

The submitted application form indicates that this is a self-build development and therefore is exempt from the requirement to achieve a 10% BNG.

A soft landscaping could be conditioned if the development was to be recommended for approval.

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. The proposal would add one additional residential unit to the site. Currently waste and recycling bins are located adjacent to the western vehicular entrance, without enclosure. No details have been provided in the submission with regards to waste and recycling storage, but there is scope to provide satisfactory means of storage in the front garden. Such matters could be conditioned if the application was to be recommended for approval.

Conclusion

The proposal is unacceptable with regards to design, character, standard of accommodation, amenity and energy sustainability considerations.

All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused. The details of the decision are set out in the RECOMMENDATION

7. CIL Applicable

It has been noted by the case officer that the CIL calculation form has been incorrectly completed to indicate that no additional dwellings are proposed to be added to the site.

On the basis of the submitted drawings, the case officer has calculated the following:

Based on the information provided, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £2,654.65 (36.5sqm x £72.73) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £2,198.76 (36.5sqm x £60.24). 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 scheme is refused for the following reasons:

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed boundary wall extensions incorporating the single storey rear/side additions and increased height of the garage, by virtue of their bulk, massing and materials, are visually dominant and out of keeping with the scale and design of boundary treatments in the locality, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and wider locality, contrary to policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017 and policy SP1 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

The proposed upper floor flat would fail to meet minimum floorspace and floor-to-ceiling height standards, with a poor standard of light and outlook provided to the loft bedroom, and would fail to provide any amenity space for a family-sized unit, contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, and policy DM16 of the Haringey Development Management Plan 2017.

The proposed single storey side/rear addition, by virtue of its excessive height, results in an unacceptable level of enclosure and visually overbearing impact, to the detriment of the amenities of the occupants of no. 100 Mannock Road, contrary to policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management Plan 2017.

The proposal fails to satisfactorily demonstrate that sustainable design, layout and construction techniques have been incorporated into the proposal, contrary to policy SP4 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and policy DM21 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.