Redwoods
PLANNING & EXTENSIONS

PLANNING STATEMENT

In support of an application for full planning permission

Section 62, Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Resubmission following refusal HGY/2025/1634 and appeal 6003187

Application by Mr Beck

to the London Borough of Haringey

for planning permission for:

Replacement of the existing pitched roof with a mansard roof extension to create one 1-bedroom 2-person self-contained flat at second floor level, with front balcony, internal alterations to the existing first floor flat, and retained refuse storage

at

2 Craven Park Road, London N15 6AB

Planning Beyond Limits

020 3781 8008
info@RedwoodsProjects.co.uk
www.RedwoodsProjects.co.uk
Unit 4 Grosvenor Way, London E5 9ND

Planning Architecture Engineering

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Statement is submitted by Redwoods Projects on behalf of Mr Beck (the applicant) in support of an application for full planning permission at 2 Craven Park Road, London N15 6AB (the Site). The description of development, as it appears on the application form, is:

> *Replacement of the existing pitched roof with a mansard roof extension to create one 1-bedroom 2-person self-contained flat at second floor level, with front balcony, internal alterations to the existing first floor flat, and retained refuse storage.*

1.2 The application is a resubmission. An earlier scheme for an additional storey with a new pitched roof above it, providing a 3-bedroom split-level flat with a rear balcony (HGY/2025/1634), was refused by the Council and the subsequent appeal was dismissed on 14 April 2026 (appeal ref. 6003187). The Inspector accepted the Council's findings on the principle of an additional dwelling, design and appearance, floor space and other standards, transport and sustainability. The appeal turned on three matters only: the overbearing effect of the additional height and bulk on 1 Olinda Road; the loss of privacy from large rear openings and the rear balcony; and refuse storage.

1.3 The scheme has been redesigned to answer each of those three findings directly. The new roof rises **140mm** above the existing ridge rather than **2,750mm**; the rear balcony has been removed; the new dwelling is a single-storey 1-bedroom flat in place of a 3-bedroom split-level unit; and the scheme adds no bins to the footway. This Statement sets out the refused scheme and the reasons, what has changed, and why the revised proposal accords with the development plan.

1.4 The application is accompanied by the existing and proposed drawings (E00–E05 and P00–P05, dated 23 June 2026, annotated with the refuse arrangement), [the daylight and sunlight assessment by [consultant]], [the fire statement under London Plan Policy D12(A)], and the CIL Additional Information form.

2.0 Site and Surroundings

2.1 The Site is a two-storey detached building with a pitched roof at the end of Craven Park Road, close to its junction with the High Road / Stamford Hill. Its front elevation sits on the back edge of the pavement and it has no front or side curtilage. The building contains two self-contained flats, one on the ground floor and one on the first floor; Valuation Office Agency records show it has been in use as two flats since at least 1993. The existing ridge stands at +7,925mm and the eaves at +5,315mm above ground level (drawing E03).

2.2 The Site is not in a conservation area and contains no listed building. It falls within the area covered by the House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD. It has a PTAL of 5 and lies within a Controlled Parking Zone, with South Tottenham, Stamford Hill

and Seven Sisters stations within a 5–10 minute walk and numerous bus routes on the High Road.

2.3 The character of this end of Craven Park Road is mixed. The officer's report on the refused scheme described it as follows:

> *This end of Craven Park Road is mixed in character, with the flank elevations of commercial buildings fronting the Hugh Road/Stamford Hill, a three-storey building (4 Craven Park Road), a group of single storey industrial and former industrial buildings from 6-18 Craven Park Road comprising vehicle repair/MOT garages and a synagogue. On the opposite side of the road is a petrol filling station and the newly built 4-storey Craven Park Mikveh. Further down the road the mainly terraced housing includes numerous additional storey extensions built under the rules of the House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD.*
>
> Officer's report, HGY/2025/1634

2.4 The immediate neighbour, 4 Craven Park Road, is a three-storey building whose top floor is set back behind a front balcony enclosed by railings. To the rear are 1 and 3 Olinda Road, two-storey houses with short rear gardens. The Inspector recorded the existing relationship in these terms:

> *There is existing intervisibility between neighbouring properties and rear gardens close to the appeal site, as well as constraints in terms of the height and proximity of surrounding buildings, as is common within a dense, urban context such as this.*
>
> Appeal decision 6003187, paragraph 6

3.0 Planning History

Reference	Proposal	Decision
HGY/2025/1634	Erection of additional storey with a pitched roof to accommodate one new 3-bedroom split-level flat within the new second floor and loft floor levels with a rear balcony/terrace at second floor level	Refused [date of decision notice]
6003187	Appeal against the refusal of HGY/2025/1634	Dismissed 14 April 2026
HGY/2007/0364 (4 Craven Park Road)	Roof extension to create an additional storey	Granted [date]

3.1 There is no other relevant planning or enforcement history at the Site.

4.0 The Refused Scheme and How It Has Been Addressed

4.1 The refused scheme added a full second storey to the building and built a new pitched roof on top of it, taking the ridge from +7,925mm to +10,675mm. It provided a 3-bedroom split-level flat over the new second floor and the new roof space, with large rear openings at second floor level and a 5.5 sqm rear balcony over the flat roof of the two-storey rear projection. The Council refused permission for two reasons, and the Inspector dismissed the appeal on the same two issues.

Refusal reason 1 — living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

> *The proposed development by reason of its height, bulk, massing and proximity to residential properties to the rear of the site, would have an overbearing relationship with these neighbouring properties, reducing their outlook and daylight to an unacceptable degree, and would create a degree of overlooking that would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupiers of those properties, to the detriment of their residential amenity and contrary to Policy D6 of the London plan (2021), and Policies DM1, DM7 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).*
>
> Decision notice, HGY/2025/1634, reason 1

4.2 On appeal the Inspector upheld the outlook and privacy limbs of this reason but not the daylight limb. On overbearing effect, the finding turned on the scale of the increase in height:

> *Despite the use of a pitched roof to the proposal, the considerable increase in height with the additional storey and overall bulk of the development would result in a much greater overbearing effect for neighbouring residents compared to the existing property.*
>
> Appeal decision 6003187, paragraph 8

4.3 On privacy, the finding turned principally on the balcony:

> *The large windows, and in particular the use of the balcony, at the second floor would also increase the likelihood of overlooking of some neighbouring properties from this higher level in comparison to views from the existing first floor windows.*
>
> Appeal decision 6003187, paragraph 9

4.4 On daylight, the Inspector found that harm had not been shown and declined to find a conflict with London Plan Policy D6:

> *Given my findings above on daylight, I am not satisfied that the proposal would be contrary to Policy D6 of The London Plan (March 2021) (the LP), which aims for development to provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context.*
>
> Appeal decision 6003187, paragraph 12

4.5 **What has changed.** The pitched roof is removed and replaced by a mansard containing the new floor. The new roof rises to **+8,065mm**, which is **140mm** above the existing ridge and **2,610mm** below the refused ridge. The eaves on the rear elevation remain at the existing level of +5,315mm, from which the mansard slope rises. The rear balcony has been removed entirely. The rear second floor openings are conventional windows set within the mansard slope rather than large glazed openings onto a terrace. The new dwelling is a single-storey 1-bedroom flat in place of a 3-bedroom unit over two new floors.

Refusal reason 2 — refuse storage

> *The proposed refuse storage arrangements are considered impractical and harmful to the amenities of other occupiers of the building in which they are to be used. As a result the development is likely to result in the permanent storage of refuse and recycling bins on the public highway, exacerbating the existing problem in this location of bins left in the street, and resulting in further harm to visual and residential amenity and to the local environment, contrary to Policy D6 of the London plan (2021), and Policies DM1, DM4 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017).*
>
> Decision notice, HGY/2025/1634, reason 2

4.6 The Inspector's finding was directed at additional bins on the footway, and at the internal store proposed as a way of avoiding them:

> *The siting of bins on the pavement is an existing characteristic in the immediate area of the site. However, placing additional bins in this section of pavement would exacerbate the existing situation and further contribute to the adverse visual impact.*
>
> Appeal decision 6003187, paragraph 14

> *Siting general waste internally and adjacent to the flat entrances would further increase the potential for harm to the living conditions of occupants.*
>
> Appeal decision 6003187, paragraph 15

4.7 **What has changed.** The internal store has been removed. The building is served by five existing 240-litre wheeled bins (1,200 litres in total), shown on drawings E01 and P01. That capacity exceeds what Haringey's waste guidance requires for three flats, and the new flat will share it. No additional bin will be placed on the footway, so the exacerbation the Inspector found at paragraph 14 does not arise. Section 7 sets this out in full.

5.0 The Proposed Development

5.1 The existing pitched roof and attic are removed and replaced by a mansard roof extension, slanted to the front and rear, containing a new second floor. The second floor finished level is +5,315mm, matching the existing attic level; the floor-to-ceiling height is 2,500mm; and the roof apex is +8,065mm (drawings P03–P05). The mansard is finished to match the existing materials.

5.2 The second floor provides one 1-bedroom 2-person flat with an open living and dining room, a kitchen, a double bedroom, a bathroom and built-in storage. To the front, the mansard is set back behind a balcony enclosed by railings, following the form of the top floor at 4 Craven Park Road. To the rear there is no balcony or terrace, and the second floor windows sit within the mansard slope.

5.3 The ground floor flat is outside the application and is unaltered. The new flat is reached from the existing communal entrance and stair. The first floor flat is reconfigured internally to accommodate the extended stair, with an open-plan kitchen and dining room and an en-suite to the principal bedroom.

Unit	Type	GIA	London Plan minimum	Storage (min.)
First floor flat	Existing 2-bedroom 3-person, reconfigured	61.57 sqm	61 sqm	—
Second floor flat	New 1-bedroom 2-person, one storey	52.25 sqm	50 sqm	1.62 sqm (1.5 sqm)

6.0 Planning Policy Context

6.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires the application to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. For this Site the development plan comprises the London Plan (2021), the Haringey Strategic Policies Local Plan (2017) and the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), together with the policies map.

6.2 The determinative policies are those cited in the refusal reasons and applied by the Inspector: London Plan Policy D6 (housing quality and standards) and DPD Policies DM1 (delivering high quality design), DM4 (waste management) and DM12 (housing design and quality), together with DM7, which the Council cited on the relationship with neighbouring gardens. The Inspector summarised their relevant aims as ensuring a high standard of privacy and amenity for neighbours, avoiding overlooking and loss of privacy, and providing adequate and easily accessible waste storage that avoids nuisance and harm to visual and other amenity.

6.3 The principle of development rests on London Plan Policies H1 and H2, which support housing delivery on small sites and the extension of existing buildings in accessible locations, and on Strategic Policies SP0 and SP2 and DPD Policy DM10. Transport is governed by London Plan Policy T6 and DPD Policies DM31 and DM32.

6.4 The National Planning Policy Framework (2026) and the House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD are material considerations. The Council is preparing a new Local

Plan; at its current stage [stage to be confirmed] it carries limited weight. The draft London Plan 2026 was published for consultation in July 2026 and likewise carries limited weight. Neither alters the assessment below.

7.0 Planning Assessment

Principle of development

7.1 The principle of an additional flat on this building has already been accepted. The Council concluded that the extension of the existing building to provide an additional residential dwelling is considered acceptable in land use terms, and the Inspector treated the principle as acceptable at paragraph 19. Nothing in the revised scheme alters that position. The proposal accords with London Plan Policies H1 and H2, Strategic Policy SP2 and DPD Policy DM10.

Design and character

7.2 The Council found the refused scheme acceptable in design terms, and so did the Inspector. The revised scheme is smaller in every dimension that bears on character. Its height is 2,610mm lower, and a mansard containing a single storey is a familiar roof form in a street where, in the officer's words, the terraced housing includes numerous additional storey extensions built under the House Extensions in South Tottenham SPD.

7.3 The front balcony and set-back top floor follow the form of the immediately adjoining building at 4 Craven Park Road, whose top floor is set back behind railings on the street elevation. The Inspector distinguished No. 4 from the refused scheme in part because it does not appear to incorporate a balcony at an elevated level to the rear elevation. The revised scheme now takes the same approach as No. 4: the balcony faces the street, and the rear is kept free of any elevated external space. On the street elevation the two buildings will read as a matched pair.

7.4 The proposal accords with London Plan Policy D3 and DPD Policy DM1.

Standard of accommodation

7.5 The new flat provides 52.25 sqm against the 50 sqm minimum for a 1-bedroom 2-person single-storey dwelling, with a double bedroom of 11.67 sqm and 1.62 sqm of built-in storage against a 1.5 sqm requirement. The floor-to-ceiling height is 2,500mm. The flat is dual aspect, with windows to the front and rear, and has good outlook, daylight and natural ventilation.

7.6 The front balcony provides **7 sqm** of private outdoor space against the London Plan Policy D6 minimum of 5 sqm for a 2-person dwelling, an improvement on the refused scheme, where a 5.5 sqm balcony fell short of the 6 sqm then required. The reconfigured first floor flat continues to meet the minimum space standard for a

2-bedroom 3-person flat. The proposal accords with London Plan Policy D6 and DPD Policy DM12.

Living conditions of neighbouring occupiers

7.7 **Outlook and overbearing effect.** The Inspector's concern was the considerable increase in height brought by an additional storey with a new pitched roof above it. That increase was 2,750mm. In the revised scheme it is 140mm. The new floor is contained within a mansard whose rear slope rises from the existing eaves line, so the building seen from 1 and 3 Olinda Road will be of essentially the same height as the existing building. The rear slope will appear more upright than the existing roof pitch, but the additional storey and new roof on top of it that drove the Inspector's finding are gone. It is submitted that the revised scheme would not have an overbearing effect on 1 Olinda Road, its ground floor rear window or its garden.

7.8 **Privacy.** The Inspector's privacy finding rested on the balcony, which he identified as the particular cause, and on large openings at second floor level. The rear balcony has been removed. The rear second floor windows are conventional windows set within the mansard slope, serving the living and dining room, the bathroom and the kitchen. The bathroom window will be obscure glazed, which can be secured by condition. The first floor of the existing building already has a kitchen window and double doors with railings facing 1 Olinda Road; the Inspector recognised that mutual overlooking exists at present. Views from the new windows will be of the same kind as those already available. Without the balcony, there is no external space at the rear from which occupiers would be expected to spend time looking towards Olinda Road. The window-to-window distance to 1 Olinda Road is no less than the approximately 7.6 metres the officer recorded for the refused scheme.

7.9 **Daylight and sunlight.** The Inspector found that no harm to daylight had been shown and did not find a conflict with Policy D6. The Council accepted, and the Inspector agreed, that the site's orientation means there would be no significant overshadowing. The officer's concern was that the refused scheme might significantly worsen a relationship in which the existing building already fails the BRE 25-degree test. With a roof 2,610mm lower than the refused scheme and 140mm above the existing ridge, any change to the existing relationship will be small. [The daylight and sunlight assessment by [consultant] confirms that [results to be inserted].]

7.10 The properties either side of the Site are unaffected; the officer found that they have no flank windows or amenity spaces adjacent to the development. Noise transmission between flats is a matter for the Building Regulations, as the officer concluded. The proposal accords with London Plan Policy D6 and DPD Policies DM1, DM7 and DM12.

Refuse and recycling

7.11 The building is built up to the back edge of the pavement and has no front, side or rear curtilage from which bins could be stored and collected. Its five existing 240-litre wheeled bins stand on the footway in front of the building, as do bins serving neighbouring properties. The Inspector accepted that this is an existing characteristic of the area. His concern was that additional bins would make it worse, and that an internal store next to the flat entrances would harm occupiers.

7.12 The revised scheme adds no bins. Haringey's waste management guidance sets the standard capacity for flatted development at 1,100 litres of refuse per six dwellings, 1,100 litres of dry mixed recycling per ten dwellings and 20 litres of food waste per dwelling. For three flats that is approximately 550 litres of refuse, 330 litres of recycling and 60 litres of food waste. The existing five bins provide 1,200 litres, annotated on drawings E01 and P01 as five 240-litre wheeled bins retained and shared by all flats with no additional bins proposed; food waste caddies are kept within each flat. The existing provision therefore has the capacity to serve the new flat without any addition.

7.13 The Council's guidance seeks off-highway storage for new development. That is not achievable at this Site, and the alternative of internal storage has been found by the Inspector to be harmful. The arrangement that best serves the street and the occupiers is the one proposed: the existing bins retained, with no increase in their number. The proposal therefore avoids the harm identified at paragraph 14 of the appeal decision, and accords with London Plan Policy D6 and DPD Policies DM1, DM4 and DM12. The applicant would accept a condition requiring a refuse management plan.

Transport and parking

7.14 The Site has a PTAL of 5 and lies within a CPZ. The development is car free, as London Plan Policy T6 expects at this level of accessibility. The officer accepted the same arrangement on the refused scheme:

> *A car free development is proposed, which given the sites high PTAL is considered acceptable. Given the small scale of the development, a formal legal agreement prohibiting future occupiers from applying for a parking permit will probably not be required.*
>
> Officer's report, HGY/2025/1634

7.15 The applicant would nonetheless enter into a unilateral undertaking restricting parking permits if the Council considers one necessary. The proposal accords with London Plan Policy T6 and DPD Policies DM31 and DM32.

020 3781 8008
info@RedwoodsProjects.co.uk
www.RedwoodsProjects.co.uk
Unit 4 Grosvenor Way, London E5 9ND

Sustainability, accessibility and fire safety

7.16 An energy strategy demonstrating the carbon reduction required by London Plan Policy SI 2 can be secured by the pre-commencement condition the Council proposed on the refused scheme. As a small-site development to an existing building, the flexibility in London Plan Policy D7 applies in the same way the officer accepted before. A fire statement under London Plan Policy D12(A) accompanies the application. The development is exempt from the biodiversity net gain condition under the de minimis exemption, as it affects no onsite habitat.

8.0 Other Material Considerations

8.1 **Consistency.** The Council has already accepted the principle, the design approach, the car-free arrangement and the standard of accommodation on this Site, and the Inspector treated those matters as acceptable. The revised scheme changes only the elements the Inspector found harmful, and in each case reduces them. Consistency in decision-making, which is a material consideration (*North Wiltshire DC v Secretary of State* (1992) 65 P&CR 137), supports approval of a scheme that has removed every element the Inspector relied on.

8.2 **The adjoining building.** 4 Craven Park Road was permitted a roof extension creating an additional storey (HGY/2007/0364), and its top floor is set back behind a front balcony. The Inspector distinguished No. 4 on its design, its rear relationship and the absence of an elevated rear balcony. The revised scheme removes each of those points of difference.

9.0 Planning Obligations and CIL

9.1 The development creates a new dwelling and is liable to the Mayoral and Haringey Community Infrastructure Levy. The CIL Additional Information form accompanies the application. No planning obligations are required, save for a unilateral undertaking restricting parking permits if the Council considers one necessary.

9.2 The applicant would accept conditions covering matching materials, obscure glazing to the rear bathroom window, the energy strategy, a refuse management plan and a construction management plan.

10.0 Planning Balance and Conclusion

Weight	Meaning in this Statement
Significant	A material benefit or harm that would on its own carry real weight in the decision
Moderate	A real benefit or harm of local consequence

020 3781 8008
info@RedwoodsProjects.co.uk
www.RedwoodsProjects.co.uk
Unit 4 Grosvenor Way, London E5 9ND

Weight	Meaning in this Statement
Limited	A benefit or harm that is real but marginal on the facts
Neutral	A matter that complies with policy and weighs neither for nor against

Benefits	Weight	Harms	Weight
One additional dwelling on a small, highly accessible site (London Plan H1, H2)	Moderate	Small change in the profile of the rear roof as seen from Olinda Road	Limited
Optimising an existing building without extending its footprint	Limited		
Principle, design, standard of accommodation, transport, refuse capacity	Neutral		

10.1 The appeal on the earlier scheme was dismissed for three reasons: an additional storey and new roof that raised the building by 2,750mm, a rear balcony at second floor level, and additional bins on the footway.

10.2 The revised scheme raises the roof by 140mm, has no rear balcony or terrace, and adds no bins.

10.3 The Inspector found no harm to daylight, and the Council and the Inspector accepted the principle of an additional flat, the design approach and the transport arrangements.

10.4 The front balcony follows the established form of the adjoining building at 4 Craven Park Road and raises no neighbour privacy issue.

10.5 The proposal accords with the development plan as a whole, and there are no material considerations indicating that permission should be refused. Planning permission should be granted.

020 3781 8008
info@RedwoodsProjects.co.uk
www.RedwoodsProjects.co.uk
Unit 4 Grosvenor Way, London E5 9ND