



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2455
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	113 Coppetts Road, Hornsey, London, N10 1JH
Proposal:	Erection of two-storey, three-bedroom dwelling with associated car parking space.
Case Officer:	Cameron Sturges
Valid Date:	13/09/2023
Applicant:	Mr Vincent Kearney
Agent:	Mr Michael Breen

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

2.1 This is an application for the erection of a two-storey, 3no. bedroom dwellinghouse with a crossover and associated parking space.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The subject site is located at the junction of Coppetts Road and Marriott Road. The surrounding area is residential and mainly comprises terraced and semi-detached houses with front and rear gardens. The site is not located within any conservation area and does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

2.3 The relevant planning and enforcement history of the site is outlined below:

HGY/1997/0547 - Erection of 2 storey side extension with roof carried over - REFUSED

HGY/1997/1540 - Erection of 2 storey side extension – APPROVED

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- LBH Transportation
- LBH Building Control

3.2 The following responses were received:

Internal:

- 1) Transportation – No objections. Details further outlined in the transport section.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The application has been publicised by way of 14 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses:

Objecting: 1

Supporting: 0

4.2 The following issues were raised in representations that are material to the determination of the application and are addressed in the next section of this report:

- The design fails to address the architectural styles, detailing and materials of the surrounding area, is bland and block-like and consequently does not contribute to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area.

4.3 The above comments have been addressed below in the discussion.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

5.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of Development;
2. Design & Appearance;
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
4. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
5. Inclusive access;
6. Energy and sustainability;
7. Trees and Landscaping;
8. Transport considerations; and
9. Waste and recycling.

Principle of Development

5.2 London Plan (2021) Table 4.1 sets out housing targets for London over the coming London Plan Policy H1 and Table 4.1 identify the overall housing targets for Boroughs (Haringey's 10-year target – 15,920). In addition, London Plan Policy H2 sets out a presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) and in Table 4.2 a minimum target for housing delivery on small sites is identified for Boroughs (Haringey's 10-year target is 2,600).

5.3 The development here is viewed to be 'backland/ in-fill development' by virtue of where the development would sit. The local plan has a specific policy on backland, infill and garden land development. Policy DM7 of the Development Management DPD states that there will be a presumption against the loss of garden land but equally the subtext of the policy outlines that for the Council to meet its housing needs, optimising existing built sites it may be necessary, but importantly such development should be of "sensitive design in order not to detract from the character of the street scene, the architectural integrity and scale of adjacent buildings or from residential amenity". Part B of the policy outlines a number of criteria that should be met in relation to infill/ backland development as set out below:

- a. Relate appropriately and sensitively to the surrounding area as well as the established street scene, ensuring good access and where possible, retaining existing through routes;
- b. Provide a site specific and creative response to the built and natural features of the area;
- c. Where appropriate, repair or re-provide street frontages and provide additional passive surveillance and increased security;

- d. Safeguard privacy, amenity, and ensure no loss of security for adjoining houses and rear gardens;
- e. Retain and provide adequate amenity space for existing and new occupants; and
- f. Incorporate at least one street frontage or be ancillary to the host dwelling and the adjacent houses/terraces.

5.4 Whilst the erection of a new dwelling at this site would contribute to housing targets, the proposed development of part of the rear garden of no. 113 Coppetts Road would result in the loss of garden land and would not have regard to the local context and design principles of the area, nor would it provide a design that is suitable or sensitive to the surrounding area and street scene. As such, the need for housing in the Borough is not considered to be outweighed by the provision of a single 3-bedroom dwelling of insufficient quality.

Design and Appearance

5.5 DPD London Plan (2021) policies emphasise the importance of high-quality and seek to optimise site capacity through a design-led approach. Policy D3 'Delivering good design' states 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 street hierarchy, building types, forms and proportions.

5.6 Local Plan Policy SP11 (2017) and Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) Policy DM1 seek to secure the highest standard of design which respects local context and character. Policy DM1 requires that new development must contribute to the character and amenity of the local area by amongst other things relating positively to neighbouring structures by having regard to building heights; form, scale and massing around the site; urban grain; local architectural styles; detailing and materials.

5.7 Policy DM7 in meeting the design expectations of Policies DM1 and DM2, require development proposals for backland/ infill sites to meet specific criteria; specifically to relate appropriately and sensitively to the surrounding area as well as the established street scene, to provide a site specific and creative response to the built and natural features of the area and to safeguard privacy and amenity to neighbouring occupiers.

5.8 The proposal is to erect a 2-storey 3no. bedroom flat roof detached dwellinghouse with parking space and associated outdoor amenity space. Materials used in the development will include brickwork and uPVC windows. The height of the dwelling will be approximately 6.6m tall, 9.9m wide and approximately 5m in depth, pulled in from neighbouring boundaries.

5.9 The surrounding residential character consists of properties with front gardens on the properties located on the northern side of Marriot Road and, spacious rear gardens afforded to the properties on the southern side of Marriot Road. The northern (rear) elevation of the proposed dwelling would be highly visible and face onto Marriot Road, located on the boundary shared with the footpath. The siting of the building here would provide little interaction with the street given the presence of its rather large and blank brick walls and block-like appearance, appearing rather awkward in its location at the corner of 113 Coppetts Road. The alignment of the dwelling is rather unusual, with the front appearing to face towards the rear gardens of No.111 as opposed to facing Marriot Street. As such, the development's strong block-like form would be prominent and intrusive in the street scene.

5.10 The proposed dwelling would result in a detrimental addition to the pattern of development within the area and unbalance the original urban layout and aesthetic of this estate and the streetscene due to its form and overbearingness. The low-quality architectural design and material selection would further exacerbate the incongruous appearance of the dwelling within its surrounding context.

5.11 Overall, the architectural appearance of the property represents a low-quality, poor design that does not respect its local context, is not sensitive to the constraints of this site and its immediate surroundings. Specifically, the siting, form and design of the proposal would introduce a dominant and discordant building which would be detrimental to the relationship with surrounding buildings resulting in a harmful appearance within the streetscene. The proposed development is therefore at odds with the abovementioned policies.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

5.12 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.

5.13 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.

5.14 The proposed dwelling is built close to the boundary with No.111 and would provide some overshadowing from the first floor to the rear gardens, given the irregular shape of the neighbouring plot. The small single storey projecting bay/outrigger would also likely provide some overshadowing. However, the area of the rear gardens that the dwelling would likely overshadow is likely to be negligible and also appears to include some vegetation and an outbuilding, thus limiting the impact of any loss of daylight and sunlight to the rear gardens here. The southern facing first floor rear window is proposed to be frosted and this would not result in any privacy impacts/overlooking to neighbouring properties. The ground floor window would be sited in a position that would limit any overlooking into neighbouring properties by virtue of the neighbouring fence and positioning of the outbuilding. It is noted that this window serves a WC/utility room and is also unusual that this is not an obscure glazed window.

5.15 The eastern flank wall is proposed to be set back approximately 5m from the boundary shared with the host property at No.113. Some overshadowing is likely to be experienced in the rear gardens of the host property, however given the adequate separation distance between the structures this is also likely to be minimal. No windows are proposed on the 1st floor eastern elevation. Ground floor windows are proposed, and these would not result in any overlooking of the neighbouring property given the suitable separation distance and a 1.8m proposed boundary fence. The western flank wall proposes 2no. windows on the first-floor elevation which would overlook rear gardens of Nos. 86 and 88 Hill Road, however, given that properties in this location have 1st floor windows, mutual overlooking of rear gardens is expected in such locations. Some separation between the properties is also provided by a rear laneway/service road which would further lessen overlooking impacts.

5.16 The low-quality design however would appear as a dominant and rather bulky addition when viewed from the immediately adjoining and surrounding properties. Despite the dwelling not resulting in a major impact in terms of overlooking, loss of daylight or sunlight, the main issue with respect to the neighbouring amenity lies within its appearance. The overall design would result in a visually intrusive, awkward and bulky development that would be detrimental to neighbouring amenity. As such, the scheme is considered to be at odds with the abovementioned policies.

Inclusive access

5.17 London Plan Policy D5 requires all new development to achieve the highest standard of accessible and inclusive design, seeking to ensure new development can be used easily and with dignity by all. London Plan Policy D7 requires that 10% of new housing is wheelchair accessible and that the remaining 90% is easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users.

5.18 In this particular case the development would be compliant with Part M4(2). A WC will also be provided on the ground floor close to the entrance to the living room, which will be suitable for ambulant disabled use.

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

5.19 London Plan Policy D6 requires housing development to provide adequately sized rooms with comfortable and functional layouts. Dwellings must at least have the gross internal floor area (GIA) set out in Table 3.1 of the London Plan and an acceptable floor to ceiling height should be delivered. Dual aspect dwellings should be maximised and single aspect units should normally be avoided. This policy also requires sufficient daylight and sunlight to be supplied to new residential units, whilst also ensuring that overheating would be avoided. Private outdoor space should be provided for new dwellings, in line with the requirements of London Plan Policy D6. Proposals should achieve the highest standards of accessible and inclusive design, in accordance with London Plan Policy D5.

5.20 The scheme proposes 84 sqm of accommodation space for a 3-bedroom, 4 person house which meets the minimum London Plan GIA requirement. As such, the proposed dwelling would accord with the abovementioned policy.

Energy and sustainability

5.21 The London Plan sets out detailed policies in relation to energy efficiency, renewable energy, climate change and water resources. Local Plan Policy SP4 promotes and requires all new developments to take measures to reduce energy use and carbon emissions during design, construction and occupation. Low- and zero-carbon energy generation are required with all new development, specifically to achieve a reduction in predicted carbon dioxide emissions through on-site renewable energy generation.

5.22 DPD Policy DM21 also requires new development to consider and implement sustainable design, layout and construction techniques, with proposals required to apply the energy hierarchy to minimise energy use in order to meet/ exceed, minimum carbon dioxide reduction requirements.

5.23 An energy report to explain how the proposal meets or seeks to address the above policy requirements was not submitted with this application. As such in the absence of such information it cannot be demonstrated that appropriate measures have been taken at the planning application stage to reduce energy use and carbon emissions and as such the proposal is considered contrary to Local Plan Policy SP4 and DPD Policy DM21.

Trees and landscaping

5.24 London Plan Policy G7 requires existing trees of value to be retained, and any removal to be compensated by adequate replacement. This policy further sets out that planting of new trees, especially those with large canopies, should be included within development proposals. DM Policy (2017) DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that the Council will expect development proposals to respond to trees on and close to the site.

5.25 The proposal seeks to remove existing vegetation and several trees at the rear gardens of the host property. The applicant has also not provided an Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan. Whilst the LBH Arboriculture team was not consulted for this application, it is likely that this supporting information would be required if the application were approved.

Transport considerations

5.26 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.

5.27 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'.

5.28 DPD Policy DM32 'Parking' states that the Council will support proposals for new development with limited or no on-site parking where there are alternative and accessible means of transport available, public transport accessibility is at least 4 as defined in the Public Transport Accessibility Index, a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) exists or will be provided prior to the occupation of the development, parking is provided for disabled people; and parking is designated for occupiers of developments specified as 'car capped'

5.29 The Council's Transportation Team has been consulted and advises that the site has a PTAL value of 2 which is considered 'poor' access to public transport services. The site is not located within a CPZ. The proposal includes provision for one car park space and this is acceptable. The vehicular crossover is subject of a separate application if the application were to be approved.

5.30 The proposal includes provision for cycle parking, however, this must be sheltered, secure and accessible. Any future application would need to demonstrate these details. A construction management statement would also be required to be provided prior to any construction if the application were approved.

Waste and recycling

5.31 DM DPD Policy DM4 requires proposals to sustainably manage waste that arises from development during the design, construction and occupation phases. All proposals should make on-site provision for general waste, the separation of recyclable materials and organic material. Adequate internal and external storage space should be provided to manage the volume of waste arising from the site. Accessible and safe access to on-site storage facilities both for occupiers and collection operatives should be supplied.

5.32 The proposed drawings indicate that the bins are located behind the gates at the vehicular access and will be inaccessible for collection unless the gates are closed. Any future submission would need to clarify this issue.

Conclusion

5.33 The scheme is considered unacceptable for the reasons outlined above, in summary as the siting, bulk and design of such a scheme would introduce a dominant and discordant building harmful to streetscene, and secondly as the scheme would fail to provide an acceptable quality of accommodation for future occupiers.

5.34 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.

6. CIL APPLICABLE

Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £5,473.8 (84.8sqm x £64.55) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £33,378.98 (84.8sqm x £393.62). This will 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.

7. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

I

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate size, siting, form and design would appear dominant and incongruous and at odds with the original urban layout and aesthetic of this estate and the streetscene, contrary to Policies D3 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017), Policies DM1, DM7 & DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

The proposed development by reason of its siting and scale would appear overbearing and visually intrusive and harmful to the visual and residential amenities in relation to adjoining properties and associated rear garden, contrary to Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021).

In the absence of an energy report outlining details for the reduction of energy use and carbon emissions during design, construction and occupation of such a dwelling, the proposal fails to satisfy the requirements of Policy DM21 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy SP4 of the London Plan (2021).