

Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1981
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	41 Baronet Road, Tottenham, London, N17 0LY
Proposal:	Erection of a rear dormer extension, a single storey side infill extension and the change of use of the property from a dwellinghouse (Class C3 Use) to a 7-bedroom, 7-person HMO (Sui-Generis Use) with the provision of refuse and cycle storage.
Case Officer:	Neil McClellan
Valid Date:	14/07/2026
	6
Applicant:	Mr Schneck
Agent:	Mr. Shloime Godlewsky

RECOMMENDATION

Approve with Conditions

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

Erection of a rear dormer extension, a single storey side infill extension and the change of use of the property from a dwellinghouse (Class C3 Use) to a 7-bedroom, 7-person HMO (Sui-Generis Use) with the provision of refuse and cycle storage.

Site and Surroundings

The application property is a two storey mid-terraced dwelling house. It has a large 2-storey rear outrigger.

The site is not located within a conservation area.

The site is located within the area of the borough covered by an Article 4 direction removing permitted development rights for changes of use from Class C3 to Class C4. It also lies within Haringey's designated Family Housing Protection Zone.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

The following history is considered relevant to the current application:

HGY/2025/2506 – Planning permission refused for the erection of an L-shaped rear dormer extension and the change of use of the property from a single dwellinghouse (Class C3) to an 8-bedroom HMO (Sui-Generis).

HGY/2025/1164 – Planning permission refused for the erection of a rear dormer extension and the change of use of the property from a single dwellinghouse (Class C3) to an 8-bedroom HMO (Sui-Generis).

HGY/2025/0008 – Planning permission refused for the erection of a rear dormer extension and the change of use of the property from a single dwellinghouse (Class C3) to an 8-bedroom HMO (Sui-Generis).

An appeal (Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3363653) against this decision was dismissed. However, in doing so the inspector did not support the LPA's reason for refusal relating to the intensity of use arising from an eight-person HMO impacting negatively on neighbouring amenity in terms of noise and general disturbance. The inspector also did not support the reason for refusal relating to the loss of family housing, citing the existing permission for its conversion to a 5-person HMO (see below). The inspector however agreed that the quality of living accommodation provided would not be of an acceptable standard due to the lack of communal living space and the inadequate size, limited head room and outlook of the two bedrooms proposed in the extended loft space.

HGY/2024/2465 – Planning permission refused for the erection of a rear dormer extension and the change of use of the property from a single dwellinghouse (Class C3) to a 7-bedroom HMO (Sui-Generis).

HGY/2024/1715 – Certificate of Lawfulness granted for a rear dormer extension.

HGY/2024/0757 – Planning permission granted for the conversion of the property to a six-person HMO (Class c4 Use). Note: While the description refers to a six-person HMO condition 3 of the decision notice limits the number of occupants to a maximum of five.

REPRESENTATIONS

Three objections have been received from local residents and one from Cllr John Bevan, local ward councillor, raising the following concerns:

- Parking congestion is already a problem making it difficult for pedestrians, particularly those with disabilities, to navigate the street. This proposal would exacerbate the situation.
- The extension and change of use will result in noise and disturbance for neighbours, from building works and after completion due to the intensification of use.
- The transient nature of the accommodation proposed undermines community cohesion.
- Over concentration of HMOs in the area and the cumulative impact of adding another.
- Impact of the dormer extension on neighbours' light and privacy.
- Impact of the dormer on the character of the area. Potential loss of light.
- Concerns regarding potential overcrowding, lack of shared amenities and the quality of the accommodation being proposed.

Officer comment: The matters raised are dealt with in the report below.

CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development
2. Standard and quality of residential accommodation

3. Design and appearance
4. Impact on neighbouring amenity
5. Transport considerations

Principle of Development

HMO accommodation plays an important role in meeting particular housing needs, especially for low-income residents, young people and those needing temporary accommodation, however as set out in Haringey's Development Management DPD 2017 (Para. 3.36) there are broader concerns in respect of losing family units to conversions, with HMOs heavily concentrated in the east of the Borough, with this leading to what it describes as "a significant loss in the availability of family housing for which there is strong need."

As such Policy DM17 set out specific criteria that is required to be met to allow approval of the conversion of a home to an HMO within the area covered by the Article 4 Direction, specifically:

a. The gross original internal floor space of the existing dwelling is greater than 120sqm.

Comment: Policy DM17 sets out a number of criteria that need to be met for such a conversion to be considered acceptable. One of the fundamental requirements is that the original, un-extended gross internal floor area (GIA) of the property must be at least 120 sqm for a conversion to HMO to be considered acceptable. Based on the submitted plans, the original un-extended house would have a gross internal floor area (GIA) of approximately 129 sqm and therefore meets the above minimum floor space requirement.

It is also noted that the property already benefits from planning permission granted 12th June 2024 under application reference HGY/2024/0757 for its conversion to an HMO for up to 5 occupants within the 4 Use Class (see history above). The principle of converting the house to an HMO has therefore already been established.

b. They do not give rise to any significant adverse amenity impact(s) on the surrounding neighbourhood, including cumulative impacts arising from an overconcentration of HMOs within an area.

Haringey's current adopted HMO policy (DM17) does not define what constitutes 'overconcentration'. Haringey's recently published its draft replacement Development Plan proposes introducing a quite stringent definition of overconcentration when it comes to HMOs. The draft policy proposes 5% or more of dwellings in a ward or 10% or more of dwellings in a street with a property licence as an HMO would be considered an overconcentration. While the draft replacement Development Plan is on its first consultation and carries little or no weight in the consideration of planning applications, it does indicate a direction of travel for the Council's approach towards HMO policy and is helpful in filling in a gap in the existing policy.

The current policy takes a local or neighbourhood approach to what might be considered an overconcentration, so it would not be appropriate at this stage in the plan cycle to apply the more strategic ward level definition. However, the 10% limit for an individual street provides a useful measure for what might be considered an overconcentration at a more local level. Particularly as the draft policy is based on up-to-date data.

No analysis of the number of existing HMOs in the area has been provided by the applicant. Based on council records there are, within Baronet Road and Baronet Grove, 58 houses, of which 9, including the application property, are licenced as some form of HMO, 15% of all houses. This is based on licenced HMO accommodation and doesn't take account of any unlicenced HMOs such as the application property.

It should be noted that none of the current HMOs mentioned above have ever been granted planning permission to operate as HMOs. Some may have been converted to HMO use prior to the Article 4 Direction restricting PD rights for such changes of use came into place. Others may have been operating for longer than ten years and therefore maybe immune from enforcement action.

Based on emerging policy, the proposal could be considered an overconcentration of HMOs within the local area. However, current policy requires there to be significant adverse amenity impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood, for overconcentration to be considered an issue. As stated above the property already benefits from planning permission for use as an HMO for up to 5 occupants. The LPA in its determination of the existing permission and the Inspector in their consideration of the appeal against the decision to refuse the proposed conversion of the house to an eight-person HMO, concluded that the conversion of the house to an HMO would not give rise to any significant adverse amenity impact(s) on the surrounding neighbourhood, including cumulative impacts arising from an overconcentration of HMOs within an area.

In considering the appeal discussed above the Inspector stated:

12. If the new HMO were fully occupied it is possible that compared to the occupiers of a single-family house or the approved HMO scheme there would be some additional activity associated with 8 unrelated residents, such as the coming and going of people to and from the house. However, there is no convincing evidence that the additional noise and general disturbance associated with these activities would be so great as to harm the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residential properties. The appellant's HMO Management Plan also outlines various measures designed to minimise the risk of potential disturbance to others.

13. On the second main issue, I conclude that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Accordingly, it would comply with DPD Policies DM1 and DM17, which state that the conversion of larger homes to HMOs will only be permitted if they do not give rise to any significant adverse amenity impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood.

Based on the above considerations, the proposed increase from a five-person HMO to a seven-person HMO is not considered a significant enough increase in activity to result in a materially harmful adverse amenity impact.

c. They are accessible by public transport, cycling and walking.

Comment: Comment: The site is located within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) 3 which is deemed to represent moderate access to public transport in qualitative terms. There are four bus routes within 30 and 600 metres walking distance of the site. The nearest rail station, Nortumberland Park, with services into Stratford is 600 metre walk from the site.

Details of refuse storage to the front and cycle storage to the rear have been provided. Sufficient space exists to provide storage for 6 full size standard wheelie bins within easily accessible timber effect enclosures. This arrangement is considered acceptable.

A timber clad cycle store with capacity for up to eight bicycles is proposed in the rear garden. The rear garden can only be accessed internally via the kitchen and hallway. While this isn't ideal, given the site's constraints, it is considered an acceptable compromise.

The site has a number of public transport options within easy walking distance and adequate cycle parking and refuse storage is proposed.

d. They provide high quality accommodation that satisfies the relevant policies of the Local Plan, including internal space standards, provision of a satisfactory level of amenity space for occupants, and adequate and convenient refuse storage and collection.

Comment: The proposed extended HMO would have a communal kitchen/dining room of approximately 15.5 sqm located on the ground floor with two sets of cooking, food storage and washing up facilities. A second communal kitchen of approximately 8.7 sqm within one set of facilities is proposed on the first floor. A communal living room of approximately 14 sqm is also proposed on the ground floor. All occupants would have access to the property's approximately 100 sqm rear garden.

All seven bedrooms will have their own en-suite shower/w.c. rooms. All are proposed as single occupancy rooms and meet the relevant floor space standards for the licencing of HMO accommodation.

Compared to the previous application for an eight-person HMO refused permission and dismissed at appeal, the current proposal has reduced the occupancy level to seven, introduced significant communal living space and ensured that all rooms meet the relevant HMO licensing floor space requirements, particularly in the case of the two rooms proposed in the extended loft space, with the larger proposed dormer ensuring that these rooms have adequate headroom and don't rely on roof lights for outlook.

This proposed revised scheme is therefore considered to overcome the reasons for refusing the application previous and for it being dismissed at appeal.

e. Where non-self-contained, have exclusive use of a kitchen or space within a shared kitchen for each household.

Comment: Haringey licensing standards for HMO's require that one kitchen is shared per three room lettings. Where this has not been provided it is acceptable to install two sets of kitchen facilities (sink/cooker) in one kitchen as long as there is adequate allowance for multiple occupants to use the space at the same time, and that no bedroom space is more than one floor above or below the kitchen.

Three sets of kitchen facilities are proposed, two in the large ground floor kitchen/diner and one set in the smaller first floor kitchen. The proposal therefore meets the licencing requirements discussed above.

Design and appearance

Design & Appearance

Policy D3 of the London Plan (2021) requires that development proposals should enhance local context by delivering buildings and spaces that positively respond to local distinctiveness through their layout, orientation, scale, appearance and shape, with due regard to existing and emerging street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions. Development should respond to the existing character of a place by identifying the special and valued features and characteristics that are unique to the locality and respect, enhance and utilise the heritage assets and architectural features that contribute towards the local character.

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD both aim to enhance the built environment through high-quality design that respects local context and positive aspects of the area. Policy DM1 sets out that development should relate positively to its locality in terms of building height, form, scale, massing, building lines and architectural details and styles.

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 and detailing of the original building.

Rear Dormer Extension

There are no examples of dormer extensions to the rear of this particular terrace. There are however examples of similar proportioned dormers further along this side of Baronet Road, and within the wider area. It is acknowledged that thus is a large dormer taking up most of the property's rear outrigger. However, the applicant has demonstrated that, with a volume of just under 40 m³ this could be built as permitted development, and that it is their intention to implement the dormer whatever the outcome of this application and are citing this as a fallback position. For a fallback position to be a material consideration, the relevant test is whether there is a "real prospect" of the fallback being implemented, a threshold materially below the balance of probabilities.

Given the real likelihood of the applicant pursuing the proposed dormer extension whatever the outcome of this current application, it is relevant to the determination of this application.

Given that dormers are a common form of extension and are generally considered an acceptable part of the character in most of the Borough's streets, outside of the conservation areas, where the majority have been carried out as permitted development, and given the fallback position described above, the proposal is considered acceptable in this instance.

Single storey rear extension.

A three-metre-deep single storey extension is proposed partly infilling the side return adjacent to the boundary with 39 Baronet Road, with a flat roof and a height of 3 metres. Given its modest size and discreet location within the property's side return it is considered subordinate in scale and acceptable in terms of its design and appearance.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

HMO

In terms of the use, the increase in occupancy from a larger family home to a 7-person HMO, given the size of the plot in which it sits, it is not considered likely to result in a materially significant increase in activity. This was the view of the Inspector in their consideration of the appeal against the decision to refuse permission for an eight-person HMO, as discussed above.

A detailed HMO Management Plan has been submitted, setting out occupancy levels, tenant selection and vetting procedures, including a prohibition on short stay holiday lets, anyone under 18 years old or anyone with a known history of antisocial behaviour. The management plan includes detailed house rules relating to noise, guests and visitors, refuse and recycling, anti-social behaviour and fire safety.

It is noted that the Inspector in considering the impact of the previous application on residential amenity attached significant weight to the submission of a similar management plan.

Given the above considerations, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

Proposed extensions

Rear Dormer Extension

Given the proposed dormer's modest size and its siting on the property's rear roof slope, it would not be considered likely to result in a material loss of sunlight or daylight or have an overbearing appearance in relation to neighbouring properties.

While it would introduce additional overlooking of neighbouring rear gardens, it is noted that in established urban/sub-urban areas such as this, there is already a significant degree of overlooking of properties by their neighbours from existing first and second floor windows. Given its modest size and siting, the proposed dormer would not give any materially harmful increase in overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

The proposed dormer would not be considered to have any materially harmful impact on the residential amenities of neighbours.

Single storey rear extension

Given the modest depth and height of the extension relative to the adjoining property at 39 Baronet Road, it would not have an overbearing appearance and would not result in an unacceptable loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure to neighbours, due to its distance from the established boundaries.

Transport considerations

As stated above, the site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) 3 which is deemed to be a moderate standard of access to public transport.

The use of this property as a HMO is not considered to have any greater impact on parking conditions over previous use as a single-family dwelling. An HMO use of this size does not meet the threshold to be designed as 'Car Free', specifically as rented and HMO occupation generates much lower levels of car ownership than the general population. Equally there is also no evidence to show that an HMO would lead to more vehicle ownership and demand for on-street parking greater than that associated with any other large residential flat.

As stated above, sufficient provision is proposed for refuse and secure cycle storage.

Conclusion

For the reasons set out above the proposed development is considered acceptable.

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

CIL APPLICABLE

The increase in internal floor area would not exceed 100 sqm. and therefore, the proposal is not liable for Mayoral or Haringey's CIL charge.

RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for approval subject to the following conditions:

Conditions:

- 1 The development to which this permission relates must be begun no later than three years from the date of this decision notice, failing which the permission shall be of no effect.

Reason: This condition is imposed by virtue of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and to prevent the accumulation of unimplemented planning permissions.

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in complete accordance with the following approved plans, drawings and documents, other than where those details are altered pursuant to the conditions of this planning permission:

P01 – Proposed Ground & First Floor Plans;
P02 – Proposed Loft Floor & Roof Plans;
P03 – Proposed Front & Right-Side Elevations;
P04 – Proposed Rear & Left-Side Elevations;
P05 – Proposed Section AA & Volumetric Diagrams;
P06 – Proposed Cycle Store Details;
P07 – Proposed Bin Store Details; &
HMO Management Plan.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

- 3 The House of Multiple Occupation hereby approved shall be occupied by no more than 7 persons at any time.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers consistent with Policy D14 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DM1 and DM23 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

- 4 The House of Multiple Occupation hereby approved shall be operated at all times in accordance with the approved HMO Management Plan (July 2026) prepared by Redwoods Projects Ltd, unless the Local Planning Authority agree to an alternative arrangement in writing.

Reason: In order to protect the amenities of nearby residential occupiers consistent with Policy D14 of the London Plan 2021 and Policies DM1 and DM23 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

- 5 The proposed eight secure and covered cycle parking spaces as set out on the approved plans shall be provided prior to the occupation of the use hereby permitted and shall be retained thereafter for this use only.

Reason: To promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policy T5 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

- 6 The approved waste and recycling storage arrangement shall be fully implemented prior

to first occupation of the HMO and thereafter permanently retained.

Reason: To promote sustainable modes of transport in accordance with Policy T5 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy SP7 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

- 7 No part of any existing structure, or one hereby granted permission shall be used as a roof terrace or balcony.

Reason: To avoid overlooking into the adjoining properties and to comply with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

Informatives:

INFORMATIVE: Hours of Construction Work

The applicant is advised that under the Control of Pollution Act 1974, construction work which will be audible at the site boundary will be restricted to the following hours:-

8.00am - 6.00pm Monday to Friday

8.00am - 1.00pm Saturday

and not at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

INFORMATIVE: Party Wall Act

The applicant's attention is drawn to the Party Wall Act 1996 which sets out requirements for notice to be given to relevant adjoining owners of intended works on a shared wall, on a boundary or if excavations are to be carried out near a neighbouring building.

INFORMATIVE: Land Ownership

The applicant is advised that this planning permission does not convey the right to enter onto or build on land not within his ownership.