Officer Report

Application Number:	**HGY/2026/0164**
Application Type:	**Full planning permission**
Address:	62 Turnpike Lane, Wood Green, London, N8 0PR
Proposal:	Construction of new 1-bed studio dwelling in rear storage yard.
Case Officer:	Ben Coffie
Valid Date:	21/09/2026
Applicant:	P Thi
Agent:	Seumas Moran

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

The site comprises the rear yard of 62 Turnpike Lane, located on the northern side of Turnpike Lane at its junction with Burghley Road. No. 62 contains a commercial unit and a studio flat at ground-floor level, together with two two-bedroom flats on the upper floors. The rear yard has historically been used for storage and contains a single-storey storage building with a mono-pitched roof, reaching approximately 4 metres in height at its highest point.

The site is bounded to the north by the flank (gable) wall of No. 1 Burghley Road, approximately 1.4 metres away. To the east lies a parking area, with Burghley Road beyond. The yard is visible from Burghley Road above the existing boundary walls and fences. To the south is the rear elevation of No. 62, approximately 5 metres away, which contains habitable-room windows and balconies serving the upper-floor flats. To the west is the rear of No. 64 Turnpike Lane.

The surrounding area is characterised predominantly by two- and three-storey terraced buildings, comprising commercial premises with residential accommodation above along Turnpike Lane and residential terraces within the adjoining side streets. The site is not located within a conservation area. The applicant advises that the site has a PTAL rating of 6b.

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

This application is for the demolition of the existing single-storey storage building and the construction of a two-storey, one-bedroom dwelling in the rear storage yard of 62 Turnpike Lane.

- The ground floor would hold an open-plan kitchen/diner of about 30sqm, with an internal staircase.
- The first floor would hold a bedroom of about 10sqm with an en-suite, plus an open first-floor terrace/balcony with a glass balustrade.
- A small garden of about 15sqm would sit between the new dwelling and the rear of No.62.
- A timber cycle store and a timber refuse store are proposed.

The building would be about 6m tall and would be clad in black zinc panels and cedar battens, with a 19mm toughened glass balustrade around the terrace.

Two means of access are proposed, comprising access from Turnpike Lane via the ground-floor hallway of No. 62, which is shared with the existing flats, and a secondary access through a gate within the eastern boundary that leads onto the adjoining parking area, itself accessed from Burghley Road.

3. PLANNING HISTORY

HGY/2022/4494 - Rear and front extension and loft conversion to create 2 x 2 bed flats and 1 x studio flat, with the retail unit retained – Refused Decision Date: 20 February 2023

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal:

1. LBH Transportation: No comments received

1. LBH Cleansing: No comments received

1. LBH Design Officer: The proposed backland dwelling was considered very poor quality and inadequately justified. Concerns included:

- a weak architectural response;
- its visibility from the side street (Burghley Road);
- inadequate contextual analysis;
- poor residential quality;
- a potentially harmful roof terrace arrangement.

5. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

No representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc. in response to notification and publicity of the application.

6. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Background / principle of development
2. Design and appearance
3. Standard and quality of residential accommodation
4. Impact on neighbouring amenity
5. Transport considerations
6. Waste and recycling

Principle of development

The site is a rear storage yard behind a mixed-use building on Turnpike Lane, so it is a backland site. Policy H1 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy SP2 of the Local Plan support new housing on small sites. However, any proposal for a new home on a backland site must meet Policy DM7 of the Development Management DPD (2017), read alongside the London Plan.

Part A of Policy DM7 presumes against the loss of garden land. This site has been used for storage, not as garden land, so the proposal does not conflict with Part A.
Part B of Policy DM7 requires such proposals to meet Policies DM1 and DM2. It also requires a high-quality design that responds creatively and sensitively to its context. Development should:

- integrate well into the local area and street scene;
- provide good access;
- respect the privacy and amenity of nearby properties;
- not create security risks;
- provide suitable outdoor space for existing and future occupiers.
- New dwellings should ideally have a street frontage or be clearly ancillary to an existing home.

The proposed dwelling would have no street frontage of its own. Two routes are proposed, and neither is acceptable:

- The Burghley Road gate: This gate opens onto a parking area that the applicant does not own. The parking area is outside the red line boundary, and the applicant has not shown any legal right of way over it. Access through this land cannot be secured or relied on to serve a new home, whether for everyday use, servicing, deliveries or emergency access.
- The route from Turnpike Lane: This route runs through the shared ground-floor hallway of No.62, past the existing studio flat, and then through the small garden of the new dwelling. It would be long, indirect and narrow. It would serve the existing flats, the commercial unit and the new dwelling all at once. The application does not show that the route is step-free, how it would be lit, or how it would work for refuse collection, bulky deliveries or fire service access.

Neither route would provide the safe, convenient, legible and inclusive access arrangements required by Policies DM7 and DM2 of the Development Management DPD (2017), nor would they satisfy the expectations of London Plan Policy D5 in respect of inclusive design. Given the reliance on these constrained and unsatisfactory access arrangements, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the site can accommodate a self-contained dwelling in an acceptable manner. Furthermore, adequate access is fundamental to the safe and effective operation of the development, including matters relating to fire safety, servicing and refuse collection, and officers note that the proposal must also be assessed against the requirements of London Plan Policy D12 relating to fire safety.

When considered as a whole, the proposal represents an unacceptable form of backland development, failing to provide satisfactory access arrangements or demonstrate that a safe and functional residential environment can be achieved. The development therefore conflicts with Policies DM7 and DM2 of the Development Management DPD (2017), together with Policies D5 and D12 of the London Plan (2021).

Design and appearance
London Plan (2021) Policies D3 and D4 require a design-led approach that optimises site capacity and responds positively to local character and distinctiveness through considerations such as layout, orientation, scale, appearance and built form. Similarly, Local Plan Policy SP11 and DPD Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standards of design, requiring development to respond appropriately to its context, including prevailing building heights, form, scale, massing, urban grain, building lines, architectural character, detailing and materials.

The proposal would replace the existing low-level and lightweight storage structure with a two-storey building reaching approximately 6m in height and occupying the majority of the rear yard. The building would be positioned in close proximity to the site boundaries, sitting approximately

1.4m from the gable wall of No. 1 Burghley Road and approximately 5m from the rear elevation of No. 62. Given its scale, massing and siting, the development would appear cramped and overbearing within this constrained backland location, introducing a form of development that would be markedly different from the established pattern of development in the surrounding area, where rear areas associated with commercial premises on Turnpike Lane are generally retained as open service yards or contain only modest ancillary structures.

The submitted street-scene drawings demonstrate that the first floor, terrace and glazed balustrade would be clearly visible above the existing boundary treatments when viewed from Burghley Road. Furthermore, the proposed palette of black zinc cladding, cedar battens and extensive glazing would contrast sharply with the predominantly brick-built terraced buildings that characterise the surrounding townscape, resulting in a visually prominent and incongruous addition when viewed from the public realm.

The Council's Design Officer raised significant concerns regarding the quality of the proposed design and concluded that the scheme was insufficiently justified. In particular, concerns were expressed regarding the weak architectural response to the site, the prominence of the development in views from the adjacent side street, and the lack of a robust contextual analysis demonstrating how the proposal responds to its surroundings.

Officers also note that the Planning Statement contains material inconsistencies when compared with the submitted drawings. The Planning Statement refers to the use of facing brick, render, aluminium-framed windows and plain roof tiles and indicates that the proposed dwelling would contain a ground-floor bedroom, whereas the submitted plans show a building finished in zinc and timber cladding with a flat roof and a bedroom located at first-floor level. These inconsistencies further undermine the design rationale presented in support of the application and do not provide a clear or convincing justification for the proposed scale, siting and appearance of the development.

Having regard to the above, the proposal would fail to deliver a high-quality and contextually responsive design, instead resulting in an overly intensive, visually intrusive and incongruous form of backland development that would appear out of character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with the policies outlined above.

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 submitted information on unit size is contradictory. The Planning Statement says the unit is a 37sqm single-storey one-bedroom, one-person unit. The drawings show a two-storey unit with a 30sqm kitchen/diner, a 10sqm bedroom, an en-suite and an internal staircase. The application does not give a clear gross internal area, so compliance with Table 3.1, including the storage and floor-to-ceiling height requirements, cannot be properly assessed.

Even if the minimum floor area were met, the accommodation would be poor overall:

<u>Outlook and light</u>
The ground-floor kitchen/diner would be enclosed by the boundary with No.64 to the west and the gable wall of No.1 Burghley Road about 1.4m to the north. Its main outlook would be south across

a small garden towards the rear elevation of No.62, about 5m away. Outlook and daylight to the main living space would be very limited. No daylight/sunlight assessment has been submitted.

Privacy
The small garden and the ground-floor windows would be directly overlooked by the upper-floor windows and balconies on the rear of No.62. The first-floor terrace would face those windows from a very short distance and as a result the development would cause overlooking both ways.

Access
As set out above, the dwelling would have no safe, convenient and legible access. That is a basic weakness in the quality of accommodation offered to future occupiers.
The Design Officer also judged the residential quality to be poor. The proposal would fail to provide a satisfactory standard of accommodation, contrary to the policies outlined above.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

London Plan Policy D6 requires development to protect the amenity of surrounding occupiers, while Policy D14 seeks to ensure that noise impacts arising from development are appropriately managed and mitigated. At the local level, Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD requires proposals to secure a high standard of privacy and amenity for neighbouring residents and to avoid unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy or other forms of harm to residential living conditions.

The proposal incorporates an open first-floor terrace enclosed by a glass balustrade and orientated towards the south and east. Given its elevated position, the terrace would provide direct views towards the rear elevation of No. 62 from a distance of approximately 5m and would also afford views across neighbouring rear areas, including the adjacent parking area and the side access serving No. 1a Burghley Road.

The rear elevation of No. 62 contains habitable-room windows and balconies serving the upper-floor flats, while the area immediately adjoining the ground-floor studio flat is also overlooked by the proposed development. As a consequence, the proposed terrace would introduce a significant degree of overlooking and would result in a material and perceived loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore, the use of the terrace as an outdoor amenity space would be likely to generate additional activity and noise in close proximity to existing residential accommodation, thereby compounding the impact on neighbouring amenity.

The Planning Statement asserts that the amenity of neighbouring occupiers would be protected through the use of obscure glazing. However, no obscure glazing, privacy screening or other mitigation measures are shown on the submitted drawings. In any event, the proposed 19mm clear glass balustrade would provide no meaningful level of screening. Officers also note that limited information has been submitted regarding the likely effects of the development on neighbouring occupiers, a matter that was similarly identified by the Council's Design Officer.

In addition to the concerns arising from the terrace, the proposed access arrangements would require future occupants to pass through the shared hallway serving No. 62. This arrangement would increase activity and footfall adjacent to the existing ground-floor studio flat and would be likely to have an adverse effect on the amenity, privacy and sense of security experienced by its occupiers.

The development would also introduce a two-storey building within a constrained rear yard, positioned approximately 1.4m from the gable wall of No. 1 Burghley Road and approximately 5m from the rear elevation of No. 62. Despite the close proximity of neighbouring properties, no daylight, sunlight or overshadowing assessment has been submitted to demonstrate that

acceptable levels of light, outlook and amenity would be retained for existing occupiers. In the absence of such information, officers are not satisfied that the proposal would avoid unacceptable impacts on neighbouring residential amenity.

For the reasons set out above, the proposal would result in unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy, increased noise and disturbance, and an insufficiently assessed impact on neighbouring living conditions. The development therefore conflicts with the policies outlined above, which seek to safeguard the amenities of neighbouring residents.

Transport considerations

London Plan Policy T1 requires development to make the most effective use of land having regard to its connectivity and accessibility. Policies T5 and T6 relate to cycle parking and car parking provision respectively, while DPD Policy DM32 supports development with limited or no on-site parking in locations with high levels of public transport accessibility and within Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs).

The site benefits from a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6b, representing the highest level of accessibility to public transport. Given the highly accessible location and the modest scale of the proposed one-bedroom dwelling, officers consider that the development could appropriately operate on a car-free basis, which could be secured by condition. The level of parking demand likely to be generated by the proposal would in any event be limited and would not be expected to have a material impact on parking stress within the surrounding highway network.

The proposal also includes provision for cycle parking in the form of a timber cycle store. However, as set out elsewhere in this report, the application fails to demonstrate that the cycle store would be served by a safe, convenient, secure and step-free access route. In particular, it has not been demonstrated that access can be achieved either through land within the applicant's control or via the shared hallway serving No. 62. As a result, officers are not satisfied that the proposed cycle parking facilities would be readily accessible or capable of meeting the requirements of future occupiers.

Notwithstanding the acceptability of a car-free approach in this location, the shortcomings in relation to access arrangements remain a significant concern in the overall assessment of the proposal.

Waste and recycling

Policy DM4 of the Development Management DPD requires development proposals to sustainably manage waste arising during the design, construction and occupation of a site. The policy expects all proposals to provide adequate on-site facilities for the storage of general waste, recyclable materials and organic waste, together with sufficient internal and external storage capacity to accommodate the likely volume of waste generated. In addition, waste storage facilities must be accessible to occupiers and capable of being serviced safely and conveniently by collection operatives.

The application proposes a timber refuse store within the garden area associated with the new dwelling. Although three bins are shown, no details are provided regarding their size or capacity. Furthermore, the submitted plans indicate that bins would need to be moved either across land outside the applicant's control or through the shared internal hallway serving No. 62 in order to reach Turnpike Lane for collection. Neither arrangement is considered acceptable. In addition, the application fails to demonstrate that the refuse store would be located within an acceptable collection distance of the public highway or how the proposed arrangement would operate

alongside the existing waste storage requirements of the commercial unit and residential accommodation at No. 62.

Notwithstanding these concerns, officers consider that there is sufficient space within the site to accommodate an appropriate refuse and recycling storage area. However, for the reasons set out above, the application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed access arrangements would allow waste and recycling facilities to be used and serviced safely and effectively. As such, the proposal fails to comply with the requirements of Policy DM4 of the Development Management DPD.

Energy, Sustainability and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)

Local Plan Policy SP4 seeks to reduce carbon emissions and energy consumption from new development through its design, construction and occupation, while Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD requires development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures and to apply the energy hierarchy. These objectives are reinforced by the sustainability policies of the London Plan, which seek to minimise carbon emissions and promote sustainable forms of development.

The submitted Planning Statement includes a brief sustainability section in which reference is made to the incorporation of sustainable drainage measures, including a water butt and rain gardens, together with a highly insulated building fabric, an air source heat pump and solar panels. The statement also asserts that the proposed dwelling would achieve compliance with Building Regulations Part L and deliver a low-carbon form of development.

However, no Energy Statement or supporting technical information has been submitted to substantiate these claims. In particular, the application is not accompanied by any assessment of baseline or proposed carbon emissions, SAP calculations, details of the proposed energy strategy, or evidence demonstrating how the proposal would comply with the energy hierarchy and achieve the reductions in carbon emissions required by adopted planning policy. As a result, officers are unable to verify the environmental performance of the development or assess its compliance with the relevant energy and sustainability requirements.

With regard to Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), the Environment Act 2021 and associated regulations require qualifying development to deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. However, having regard to the size and nature of the site, which extends to less than 0.2 hectares and comprises previously developed land, the proposal would be exempt from the statutory BNG requirements and would therefore not be required to submit a Biodiversity Gain Plan.

Notwithstanding the proposal's exemption from the statutory BNG requirements, the absence of an Energy Statement and supporting sustainability information means that the application has failed to demonstrate compliance with Local Plan Policy SP4, Policy DM21 of the Development Management DPD (2017) and the relevant sustainability objectives of the London Plan (2021). Accordingly, the proposal is not considered acceptable in energy and sustainability terms.

Conclusion

The proposed development would represent an unacceptable form of backland development that has failed to demonstrate safe, convenient and inclusive access for future occupiers, servicing and emergency access. The confined nature of the site, together with the scale, siting and appearance of the proposed dwelling, would result in a cramped and incongruous form of development that would be out of keeping with the established character and pattern of the area.

In addition, the proposal would provide a poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers and would result in unacceptable overlooking, loss of privacy and disturbance to neighbouring residents. Furthermore, insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate compliance with the relevant energy and sustainability requirements.

Having regard to the above, the proposal is considered contrary to the Development Plan as a whole, and planning permission should therefore be refused for the reasons set out below. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out below.

7. CIL

If permitted, the development would be liable for CIL because it would create a new dwelling. Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge would be £2,843.6 (40 sqm x £71.09) and the Haringey CIL charge would be £11,046.4 (40sqm x £276.16) (Indexation included)). This would be collected by Haringey after/should the scheme is/be 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

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development would rely either on access across land outside the applicant's ownership and control, over which no legal right of access has been demonstrated, or on a long, constrained and indirect route through the communal hallway serving 62 Turnpike Lane. In the absence of a satisfactory access arrangement, it has not been demonstrated that future occupiers, servicing arrangements, refuse collection operatives and emergency services would be able to safely, conveniently and inclusively access the site. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to provide an acceptable standard of access and would conflict with Policies D5 and D12 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DM2, DM4 and DM7 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).

The height, bulk, siting and cramped relationship of the proposed two-storey dwelling to the site boundaries and neighbouring buildings, together with the use of incongruous materials, would result in a poor-quality and visually intrusive form of development. In particular, the proposal would appear prominent and out of keeping in views from Burghley Road and would fail to respond positively to the established character, appearance and pattern of development within the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policies DM1 and DM7 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

The constrained backland location of the site, together with the limited outlook and access to natural daylight available to the principal living accommodation, the overlooking of the proposed private amenity space, and the unsatisfactory access arrangements, would result in a poor standard of accommodation for future occupiers. Furthermore, the submitted information does not clearly demonstrate compliance with the minimum internal space standards. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed first-floor terrace, by reason of its location, siting and proximity to the rear elevation

of 62 Turnpike Lane, would result in direct overlooking, loss of privacy, and increased noise and disturbance to the occupiers of the existing residential units at No. 62. The proposal would therefore cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring residential amenity and would be contrary to Policies D6 and D14 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

No Energy Statement has been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would adequately reduce carbon emissions, minimise energy use, or comply with the energy hierarchy as required for new residential development. In the absence of this information, it has not been demonstrated that the proposal would achieve the required environmental performance or meet zero-carbon and sustainability objectives. The development is therefore contrary to Policy SP4 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policy DM21 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).