

Application Number:	HGY/2026/1852
Application Type:	Change of use
Address:	13 Birkbeck Road, Tottenham, London, N17 8NH
Proposal:	Change of use of the existing 2no. self-contained flats inc. 1no. family-sized dwelling (Use Class C3) into a 8-bed 11-person House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class Sui Generis) with shared facilities. Demolition of existing ground floor rear extension and part of rear infill extension. Erection of ground floor single storey rear extension, part first floor infill rear extension, part second/loft floor rear extension with 1no. rooflight, mansard roof extension with 5no. small dormer windows. (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)
Case Officer:	Daniel Boama
Valid Date:	14/08/2026
Applicant:	6
Agent:	Mr & Mrs Joannou Mr Chris Georgiou

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Site location

The application site comprises a two-storey, mid-terrace dwelling with a parapet and butterfly roof on the west side of Birkbeck Road. The existing property comprises a 3-bedroom self-contained flat on the ground floor, and a 2-bedroom self-contained flat on the first floor. The property is different to the neighbouring properties because it has a butterfly roof with a parapet wall and is higher than the neighbouring properties. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in nature, characterised by long terraces of dwelling houses.

The property is not located within a conservation area. The property is located within a 'Family Housing Protection Zone', as introduced in the 2017 local plan to restrict further residential conversions in areas identified as already having a high concentration of converted properties. It is also pointed out that the application site and this part of the borough is subject to an Article 4 Direction which came into force in November 2013, removing permitted development rights for a change of use from a single family dwelling house (Use Class C3) to a HMO (Use Class C4).

2. Description of Proposal

The application proposes a change of use of the existing 2no. self-contained flats inc. 1no. family-sized dwelling (Use Class C3) into a 8-bed 11-person House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use

Class Sui Generis) with shared facilities. Demolition of existing ground floor rear extension and part rear infill extension. Erection of ground floor single storey rear extension, part first floor infill rear extension, part second/loft floor rear extension with 1no. rooflight, mansard roof extension with 5no. small dormer windows. (AMENDED DESCRIPTION)

The description was amended to reflect the reduced number of persons from 15 to 11. This was after the applicant provided revised drawings, although these were not requested by the Case Officer.

Proposed floor levels

Ground Floor

The proposed ground floor plan will accommodate 3 x double letting rooms with ensuite and one communal kitchen. The refuse storage will be in the front garden and the cycle storage will be in the rear garden.

First Floor

The first floor plan will accommodate 1 x single letting room and 2 x double letting rooms, all of which will have an ensuite, and there will be one communal kitchen/lounge.

Second/Loft Floor

The second/loft floor plan will accommodate 2 x double letting rooms with ensuite, and one small communal kitchen.

Proposed Extensions

Ground floor single storey rear extension

The proposed ground floor single storey rear extension would replace the existing rear extension that accommodates the kitchen and bathroom for Flat 1, and be built from the rear wall of the main house and the rear wall of the rear infill extension that was built under planning permission ref. HGY/1996/0266, which was built to be flush with the main house rear wall. This extension would accommodate the communal lounge/kitchen and Room 3. This proposed extension would replace the monopitched roofs with a flat roof.

Part first floor rear extension

The part first storey rear extension would be built above the infill rear extension under permission HGY/1996/0266. It would infill the gap by being built up to the same depth as the rear wall at No.11 next door, and would accommodate Room 4.

Part second/loft floor rear extension

The part second/loft floor rear extension would be built above the existing staircase to create a staircase into the mansard roof accommodation at second/loft floor level. It would be built up to the same depth as the staircase at first floor level. It would have 1no. roof light above and rear facing window.

Mansard roof

The mansard would comprise of 3no. rooflights that align with the 3no. dormer windows at first floor level and be of a similar character and appearance. It would have 2no. rear facing dormer windows, one either side of the staircase. The windows provide light to the Rooms 3 and 4, the accompanying ensuites and the communal kitchen to front. It would have a flat roof.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The most recent applications for this site are summarised as follows:

HGY/1996/0266

Proposal: Erection of single storey rear extension and conversion of the property into 1 x 2 bedroom flat and 1 x 1 bedroom flat.

Decision Date: 28 May 1996

Decision: Approve with Conditions

HGY/1996/0812

Proposal: Details pursuant to Condition 2 attached to planning permission HGY/50838 for the erection of a dustbin enclosure.

Decision Date: 16 July 1996

Decision: Approve with Conditions

4. Internal & Statutory Consultation

The following were consulted regarding the application:

LBH Transportation Group: Objection. Recommendations as follow:

1. The applicant needs to show on the proposed ground floor plan long-stay cycle parking in line with LPG Support for Housebuilding (2026) standards. Long-stay cycle parking should be easily accessible, weatherproof and secure and conform to LCDS design standards.
2. The quantum and design specification of the long-stay cycle parking should be clearly annotated on plans and details of weatherproofing and security provided.
3. The location of the proposed long-stay cycle parking in the rear communal garden shown on the proposed ground floor plan does not appear to show any side access to/from the store. It would appear that users of the cycle store would have to wheel their cycles through several sets of doors. This is sub-optimum and not policy compliant with London Plan Policy T5 which requires ease of access to cycle parking.
4. The location of the refuse store should be annotated on the plan giving details of waste storage capacity demonstrating how it meets to Council standards
5. The applicant needs to outline servicing and delivery arrangements for the site.
6. Since the site is in a PTAL 4 and in a CPZ the applicant will be required to agree to a s106 agreement making the development car-free and permit-free (only exception being for blue badge holders).
7. The applicant will need to prepare a Construction Management Plan (CMP) in which it addresses issues (not limited to): provision of a work programme, details of measures as to how it will mitigate the construction impact upon the highway network and local community, agree to not receiving works movements at high peak periods (08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00) and at school drop-off and pick-up times (08:00-09:00 and 15:00-16:00), arrangements for accommodating construction and demolition vehicles deliveries e.g. early/late unexpected deliveries, details of any footway/parking bay suspensions that maybe required, a commitment to ensuring highways and footways are kept clean of dust and debris and measures to reduce environmental impact of works movements. Details of any measures to reduce waste movements should be outlined e.g. any green/reverse logistics strategies to be employed. Of particular concern in this case is how the

construction process will be managed to mitigate impact on the immediate local neighbourhood and highway network given the residential nature of Birkbeck Road. The CMP should be secured via a pre-commencement condition.

8. The applicant will be required to undertake a highway dilapidation survey prior to works commencement and agree to work with the Council's Highways department to make good any footway or highways that maybe damaged during the construction and demolition works process.

Transport Recommendations:

The application will only be acceptable, once the above-mentioned issues have been addressed.

LBH Public Health:

Objection on grounds of concerns that the property is inadequate to comfortably accommodate up to 15 individuals.

The proposed bedroom accommodation raises significant concerns in relation to the minimum room sizes set out within Haringey's Standards for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs). For single-person lettings, the standards require a minimum floor area of 10 m² where a separate kitchen is provided (inclusive of any en-suite facilities), while two-person lettings require a minimum floor area of 15 m² where kitchen facilities are provided elsewhere. On the assumption that the smallest room, Room 4, is the single person-dwelling, the 10.4 m² floor space is on the precipice of acceptable levels, however when you subtract the en-suite floor space from the 10.4 m², then Room 4 would fall below the 10 m² threshold. Based on the floor areas submitted, four of the proposed double occupancy rooms (Rooms 1, 5, 6 and 7) fall below the minimum standard for double occupancy even before the impact of the en-suite facilities is fully considered. When the floor area occupied by the en-suites is reasonably deducted, the usable bedroom space in these rooms is estimated to be approximately 10 m², 10 m², 10 m² and 9 m² respectively, representing a substantial shortfall against the required 15 m² standard. Furthermore, Rooms 2, 3 and 8 appear likely to fall below the minimum threshold once accurate en-suite measurements are subtracted from the gross floor areas. As the applicant has not provided separate floor area calculations for the en-suite facilities, it is not possible to robustly assess compliance. However, on the basis of the information available, there is a strong likelihood that none of the eight bedrooms would meet Haringey's minimum HMO space standards. The proposed accommodation therefore risks providing an unacceptable standard of living for future occupants, with insufficient space for sleeping, storage, study, and day-to-day activities, potentially resulting in overcrowded and poor-quality living conditions.

Although there is a moderate rear garden for shared use, adequate indoor shared amenity space should be provided to avoid residents being limited to spending time in their respective bedroom, which can have a negative impact on mental health and wellbeing (especially as the bedrooms are below the expected space standard).

The proposed kitchen provision appears inadequate for a House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) accommodating 15 residents and does not appear to meet the standards set out in Haringey's HMO Standards. The limited amount of cupboard storage, food preparation space and fridge/freezer capacity may restrict residents' ability to store sufficient food and prepare fresh, healthy meals. Furthermore, none of the three communal kitchens appears to provide adequate facilities for the number of occupants proposed. The ground-floor, first-floor and proposed second-floor kitchens each contain only one sink, one oven and one refrigerator for 6, 5 and 4 residents respectively. Of particular concern is the proposed second-floor communal kitchen, for which no floor area measurements have been provided. In the absence of this information, it is not possible to determine whether the space complies with minimum standards. Based on the submitted plans,

however, the kitchen appears undersized and unlikely to provide sufficient circulation space, storage, worktop area or cooking facilities for four residents.

We recognise that HMOs are an important provision of affordable housing to residents in Haringey, however, as highlighted in Policy DM17 it is important that high quality accommodation is provided, with enough internal space and a satisfactory level of amenity space for occupants. We believe this is not reached in this application and this could have a detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of residents.

Officer response: The applicant provided revised drawings that reduced the number of persons proposed from 15 to 11 people, so four of the double lettings were changed to single lettings in Rooms 1, 5, 6, and 7 in order to be compliant with the minimum space standards set by the Council. However, this only tackles the floor area not the other concerns and issues with the proposal.

LBH Design:

- One-off house with 2 butterfly roofs behind a parapet on street frontage.
- Garden too small
- Neighbouring terraced house all much smaller - single frontage (room) rather than this double fronted narrower plots, tower floor - floor and overall heights front/back pitched roofs.
- Butterfly roof behind high parapet - at rear meeting near gables, not hipped. Rear elevation steps back and has small lean-to-extension. All proposals in street and behind (Bruce Castle Road) short (generally shorter because they have deeper building plots due to outriggers)
- Exceeds the minimum existing (original) floor area in Article 4.
- A mansard is a reasonable form of additional floor for this sort of property, with a flat or butterfly roof behind a parapet. Proposed fenestration acceptable
- Not in a conservation area, but a double pitched mansard (shallow upper pitch rather than flat), would be preferable.
- Overall height kept down; as a result the floor-ceiling height in additional floor does not appear sufficient (albeit drawings are unclear and contradictory) and front windows are mostly hidden behind a parapet. This results in poor outlook and daylight which is unacceptable
- Proposed tower at the rear is excessive and likely to have unacceptable impact on neighbouring rear gardens. Stairs should be designed into the mansard and section required to demonstrate this in future proposals.

5. Local Representations

The following representations were received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application.

No of responses: 14

Objecting: 14

The comments made raise the following concerns:

- Loss of family-sized housing - High concentration of conversions of family houses to HMOs in this area of the borough leading to a loss family-sized housing in the existing building and locality.
- Land use - Replacing the existing 2 flats with an 8-room HMO represents a substantial intensification, which is aided by the physical alterations. Accommodating up to 15 people

in a property of this type would generate substantially greater levels of household wastes and recycling. Increase in occupancy would lead overcrowding and impact on street cleanliness.

- Overconcentration of HMOs on neighbouring streets as well.
- Overdevelopment - The proposed substantial physical alterations that should be considered with the proposed intensification of occupation.
- Transport considerations - Parking capacity on the street is limited, so the disproportionate number of proposed residents to the existing accommodation add pressure on parking.
- Transport considerations - Lack of bike storage proposed.
- Pressure on local services - Overflowing bins attracting vermin, risk of litter and fly-tipping from existing HMOs.
- Standard of accommodation - Inadequate living conditions due to cramming into spaces not designed for HMOs.
- Neighbour amenity - Noise disturbance due to increased occupancy, some occurring late at night at existing HMOs on the street.
- High turnover of occupants, poor upkeep of property, potential for a more transient population that reduces long-term community stability, and concerns that some HMOs have been used as a squat-type of accommodation.
- Adding more residents to a small and narrow road would create extra pressure.
- Other - Lack of confidence in the managing agents/landlord dealing with any issues that may arise such anti-social behaviour and crime
- Other - Safety concerns from potential occupants as there has been documentation of concerns of congestion, antisocial and criminal behaviour, drug-related and fires regarding existing HMOs on the street.

Officer response:

- Loss of family housing - It is acknowledged that the existing ground floor flat is a family-sized dwelling and this has been taken into consideration.
- Land use - The proposed number of residents has reduced from 15 people to 11 people following receipt of revised drawings, but the number of rooms remains as 8 bedrooms.
- Design - The proposed extensions have been addressed in the report.
- Overconcentration and loss of family-sized housing - The Council's HMO register shows that there are 8 registered HMOs on the street, however, the proposed development in the Family Housing Protection Zone where there is a protection on the loss of family-sized housing units.
- Bicycle storage - The proposed number of bicycles would be 8 bicycles for 8 rooms which aligns with London Plan policy T5.
- Parking pressure - Should the proposal be given planning permission, the applicant would need to apply for a Section 106 agreement that makes the development car-free and removes parking permits from all potential residents.

6. Assessment of Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development/ land use;
2. Design and appearance;
3. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
4. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
5. Transport considerations;
6. Waste management

Principle of development / land use

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 120m²:

Comment: The gross original internal floor space of the original dwellinghouse without the extensions is at 133.66 sqm, therefore it meets the requirement being greater than 120 sqm.

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;

Comment: It is accepted that an over concentration of HMOs can affect the character of the area and harm the need to support mixed and balanced communities. Also, Policy DM16 seeks to maintain a supply of larger family homes to meet Haringey's housing need by restricting further residential conversions in areas of the Borough identified as already having a high concentration of converted properties. This will ensure the Council can protect the remaining existing stock of family houses (3+ bedrooms) within these areas (see Figure 3.1 'Family Housing Protection Zone'5), and to ensure that, across the Borough, the range of Haringey's housing needs can be met. 'Family housing' is defined in the London Plan 2021 glossary at page 505 as 'A dwelling that by virtue of its size, layout and design is suitable for a family to live in and generally has three, four, five, or more bedrooms'.

In a dismissed appeal in 2025 involving a 6 person HMO (ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3370728), the Inspector acknowledged the relationship between Policy DM16 and DM17:

Policy DM17 applies at the site-specific level and, when read alongside Policy DM16, is intended to prevent the incremental erosion of much-needed family housing in areas where such stock is under pressure. Permitting the appeal scheme would erode the stock of smaller family dwellings that the policy seeks to protect and could make it more difficult for the local planning authority to resist similar proposals.

The Inspector stated the following regarding living conditions:

The appeal property is a mid-terraced dwelling situated in a quiet residential street. Occupation by six unrelated individuals introduces a materially different pattern of use compared with a single household. Each occupant is likely to have separate routines, receive visitors independently, and make individual use of shared facilities. This tends to generate more frequent comings and goings, multiple sources of noise such as music or conversation, and greater intensity of use of communal areas, both internally and externally. In a closely spaced residential setting such as this, the cumulative effect of such activity is likely to be perceptible and potentially disruptive to neighbouring residents, particularly in terms of noise and general disturbance.

The appearance and character of the property is unique and larger in comparison to the neighbouring properties, but it is still originally a mid-terraced dwelling, which adjoins small mid-terraced properties that dominate the appearance and character of the street. The change of use

of existing two flats to an 8-bedroom HMO would introduce an increase in pressure on the street above the current pressure that is existing, including a difficulty in managing waste and bin overflow that would be detrimental to the amenity of the neighbours. These issues have been expressed by local residents who have experienced these effects from the existing HMOs on the street as well as reported cases of anti-social behaviour. The use of the premises as a HMO results in increased comings and goings, and a general intensification of a property in a street that was originally made for family housing. The applicant provided revised drawings that reduced the occupancy from 15 people to 11 people, however, the proposed change of use will still, with their separate living patterns, visitors and associated activity, likely result in a materially significant increase in noise and general disturbance, to the likely detriment of adjoining occupiers' residential amenity.

The proposal would thereby result in an unacceptable loss of family housing for which there is an identified need, and will result in an overconcentration of HMOs in the street that would be detrimental to the adjoining occupier and overall locality. As such the proposal would be contrary to London Plan policy, Local Plan Policy SP2, DM16 and DM17 of the adopted Development Management Development Plan Document (2017).

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

Comment: The site is located within an area with a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) 4 which is deemed to be good access. There is 1 bus route accessible to the south on Lordship Lane that connects the site to Seven Sisters station and Tottenham High Road. It is within a 10-minute walk to Bruce Grove Overground station.

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 plans show that there will be a refuse store in the front communal garden and an enclosed bicycle store for 8 bicycles in the rear garden. However, there are concerns with the bicycle store being at the rear, which would mean that the bicycles would have to be carried through the corridor and multiple doors to reach the front.

The plans show that all of the rooms meet the minimum requirements set by the Councils' internal space standards for HMOs. However, the rooms in the mansard roof accommodation would have windows that would be blocked by the existing parapet roof, so they would have inadequate access to natural light.

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

Comment: There would be 3 kitchens for 11 people. The ground floor kitchen would provide for 5 people, the first floor kitchen for 3 people, and the loft kitchen for 3 people. Although is not exactly 1 kitchen per 3 lettings, both the ground floor kitchen/lounge and first floor kitchen/lounge would be of a reasonable size to cater to the occupants residing on the same floor per kitchen.

Design and appearance

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and

sensitively in relation to the context. DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' requires development proposals to relate positively to their locality, while Local Plan (2017) Policy SP11 requires the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and historic significance, which is equally supported by London Plan (2021) Policy D6.

The proposed development would remove one ground floor rear extension and erect four extensions to accommodate the increased capacity. The mansard roof is kept low to keep the height down, which is at the expense of the proposed 3no. dormer windows being blocked by the existing parapet. This would lead to rooms 7 and 8 in the loft floor level losing access to natural daylight and sunlight and have their outlook blocked. Also, the introduction of the second floor rear extension tower for the staircase would be an excessive addition to the rear elevation and have an overbearing impact on the properties facing the site.

The proposed second floor rear tower roof extension for the staircase would introduce a discordant feature to the rear elevation of the building detracting from the visual appearance of the property and is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area by reason of excessive depth, overall bulk and scale in relation to the property contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021.

The general intensification cause by mansard roof represents an intensification in relation to the area of the site and the properties in the locality, due to the overall increased size and bulk to accommodate the increase in number of occupants for the proposed HMO thereby causing demonstrable harm. This is contrary to Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan 2021 and supporting guidance, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policies DM1, DM12, and DM17 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

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 DM17 largely echo some of the design aspects covered within policy D6 of the London Plan.

The proposal would seek the conversion of self-contained flats (C3) into 8 room 11-person HMO (Sui Generis) which would be as follows as per the revised plans:

Room | Size (sqm) | Letting no. | Minimum requirement (sqm) | Size Complies? | Ensuite | Floor level

Room 1	14.5 sqm	1 persons	10 sqm	Yes	Yes	Ground floor
Room 2	17.0 sqm	2 persons	15 sqm	Yes	Yes	Ground floor
Room 3	17.0 sqm	2 persons	15 sqm	Yes	Yes	Ground floor
Room 4	10.4 sqm	1 person	10 sqm	Yes	Yes	First floor
Room 5	11.9 sqm	1 person	10 sqm	Yes	Yes	First floor
Room 6	12.0 sqm	1 person	10 sqm	Yes	Yes	First floor
Room 7	12.8 sqm	1 person	10 sqm	Yes	Yes	Loft floor
Room 8	18.3 sqm	2 persons	15 sqm	Yes	Yes	Loft floor

Although the proposed rooms meet the minimum requirements for the required floor area and each room provides an ensuite, and the communal kitchens/lounges are of a reasonable size to accommodate for the number of lettings proposed, the proposed development would not provide

an inadequate standard of accommodation due to the parapet wall blocking the access to natural light and preventing outlook from rooms 7 and 8.

The proposed mansard roof, by reason of poor design from the existing parapet blocking the access to natural daylight and sunlight and a loss of outlook for rooms 7 and 8, would lead to an inadequate standard of accommodation for future occupants contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing. London Plan Policy D14 requires development proposals to reduce, manage and mitigate noise impacts.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to amenity of neighbouring resident.

The change of use of two flats to an 8-bedroom HMO is likely to introduce an increase in pressure on the street above what is currently existing, including a difficulty in managing waste and bin overflow that would be detrimental the amenity of the neighbours. The use of the premises as an HMO results in increased comings and goings, and a general intensification of the residential use of the premises to a certain extent, including use of the amenity space.

The applicant provided revised drawings that reduced the occupancy from 15 people to 11 people, but the change of occupancy from two self-contained flats to an 8-room 11-person HMO will, with their separate living patterns, visitors and associated activity, likely result in a materially significant increase in noise and general disturbance, to the likely detriment of adjoining occupiers' residential amenity.

The proposed development, by reason of increased occupancy and intensification of the site, would lead to an increase in activity and movement of people on the site that would put additional pressure on local services and be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties in the locality. As such, this development is contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policies SP0 and SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.

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 in an area with a PTAL Score of 4, so it has excellent access to public transport services and the site is also in a CPZ, so the applicant would need to agree to a s106 agreement to make the development car-free and permit free. The proposed number of cycles meets the requirements for the number of rooms proposed.

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. For both flats, considering that Flat 1 could be a 2bed instead of a 1bed, refuse allocation would be 240 litres, dry mixed recycling allocation would be 240 litres, and food waste allocation would be 25 litres.

Further details would need to be demonstrate the front garden can accommodate the waste storage and recycling storage requirements for this proposal.

Conclusion

The proposal would lead to the loss of a single-family dwelling in the existing ground floor level flat in a Family Housing Protection Zone. The size and bulk of additions to the property in combination with the increased occupancy number would lead to an overdevelopment and intensification to accommodate this increase that would have cumulative impact on neighbouring amenity. The poorly designed mansard roof would lead to a poor standard of accommodation for rooms 7 and 8, due to the parapet wall blocking their access to natural daylight and sunlight and causing a loss of outlook.

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

7. Recommendation

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

Refusal Reasons:

The proposal, by reason of change of use, would thereby result in an unacceptable loss of family housing for which there is an identified need, and will result in an overconcentration of HMOs in the street that would be detrimental to the adjoining occupier and overall locality. As such the proposal would be contrary to Local Plan Policy SP2, DM16 and DM17 of the adopted Development Management, Development Plan Document (2017).

The proposed second floor rear tower roof extension, by reason of size and location, would

introduce a discordant feature to the rear elevation of the building detracting from the visual appearance of the property and is therefore detrimental to the visual amenity of the area. As such it is contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021.

The proposed mansard roof, by reason of poor design from the existing parapet blocking the access to natural daylight and sunlight and a loss of outlook for rooms 7 and 8, would lead to an inadequate standard of accommodation for future occupants contrary to Policy DM1 and DM17 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

The proposed development, by reason of increased occupancy and intensification of the site, would lead to an increase in activity and movement of people on the site that would put additional pressure on local services and be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring properties in the locality. As such, this development is contrary to Policy DM1 of The Development Management DPD 2017 and Policies SP0 and SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017.