



Officer Report

Application Number:

HGY/2023/0100

Application Type:

Householder planning permission

Address:

88 Alexandra Park Road, Hornsey,
London, N10 2AE

Proposal:

Erection of a two storey rear extension to 88 Alexandra Park, together with installation of new doors/windows to existing building, provision of balconies/terraces and reconfiguration of internal layouts of flats. Demolition of existing dwelling and garage to the rear. Erection of a new two storey building to the rear, containing two new self-contained dwellings.

Case Officer:

Cameron Sturges

Valid Date:

09/08/2023

Applicant:

MR MUKHBINDER CHANA

Agent:

mrs Neha ABAYAWARDANA

1. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

2. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed Development

2.1 The scheme proposes to erect a two-storey rear extension to 88 Alexandra Park Road, together with installation of new doors/windows to the existing host building, provision of balconies/terraces and reconfiguration of internal layouts of flats. The proposal also includes the demolition of the existing dwelling and garage at 1 Rosebery Mews and the erection of a two-storey building, containing 2no. self-contained dwellings.

Site and Surroundings

2.2 The subject site of 88 Alexandra Park Road is a 3-storey Edwardian era end of terrace property located at the junction between Alexandra Park Road and Rosebery Road, comprising ground floor shopfronts and 4no. residential flats. 1 Rosebery Road is a single dwelling with associated garage located behind the service road of 88 Alexandra Park Road and the streetscene here is predominantly made up of residential dwellings.

2.3 The subject site is located within the Muswell Hill Conservation Area (CA) but does not fall within the curtilage of a listed building. 88 Alexandra Park Road is also located within the Alexandra Park Road Local Shopping Centre Area.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

2.4 The most recent planning history relating to the site is as described below:

88 Alexandra Park Road

No history available.

1 Roseberry Mews

HGY/2003/1204 - Change of use of existing light industrial building to a one-bedroom dwelling house. Erection of single storey front extension and alterations to elevations – APPROVED 19/08/2003

3. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

3.1 The following were consulted regarding the application:

- LBH Conservation
- LBH Transportation

The following responses were received:

1) Conservation – Objects to the proposal, as outlined below:

- There is an opportunity to improve the rear of No. 88 and the existing mews building. However, the quality of the submission is a concern, there is missing and inconsistent information and drawings. There has not been enough analysis or design to explore and demonstrate the impact of the proposals on this part of the Conservation Area. There is not enough information provided to assess the quality of the proposed design.
- There is also an in principle concern over the scale of the proposed extension and the design of the proposals which would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Muswell Hill Conservation Area by eroding the legibility in the

development of this part of Muswell Hill would erode fundamental characteristics of the Edwardian streetscene where there is a marked difference between the hard streetscape that form the busy commercial parts of area and the more verdant, tree lined quieter residential streets that surround it.

- As the Muswell is a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and any harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against public (not private) benefits. Accordingly, as the proposals are considered to cause less than harm to the significance of the Conservation Area, Conservation would not support this application.

2) Transportation – Raises objections to the proposal, further outlined in the Transport section.

4. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

4.1 The following were consulted:

- Neighbouring properties
- Muswell Hill & Fortis Green Association

4.2 The application has been publicised by way of press advert, site notice and 28 letters. The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups etc in response to notification and publicity of the of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses:

Objecting: 1

Supporting: 0

4.3 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:

- Loss of privacy.

5. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Principle of Development;
2. Design & Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
3. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
4. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
5. Inclusive access;
6. Transport considerations;

7. Energy & Sustainability; and
8. Waste & recycling.

Principle of the 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). As such, this proposal would make a minor contribution to the overall housing target for the Borough, as well as the housing delivery target for small sites.

5.3 London Plan (2021) Policy H2A outlines a clear presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites (below 0.25 hectares in size) and sets out a minimum target in Table 4.2 for boroughs (Haringey 10-year target is 2,600). London Plan Policy D6 seeks to optimise the potential of sites, having regard to local context, design principles, public transport accessibility and capacity of existing and future transport services.

5.4 Local Plan Policy DM43 relates to local shopping centres and states that the use of ground floor units for appropriate town centre uses will be permitted where a) the overall number of units in non-retail use (including extant planning permissions) will not exceed 50% across the entire frontage, unless it can be demonstrated the proposal will significantly enhance the vitality and viability of the centre; and b) an active frontage is provided, or if this is not possible, a window display or other appropriate town centre frontage.

88 Alexandra Park Road

5.5 The proposed extension would be constructed at the rear of 88 Alexandra Park Road and therefore the location of the site at the rear of the property means that the proposal would not result in the loss of an active frontage. The proposal would not result in any loss of commercial floorspace, and therefore the viability of the local shopping centre would not be harmed. The provision of extra accommodation would add a small level of footfall to the local shopping centre supporting the vitality of this designated area. Overall, the scheme would not detract from the function, appearance, viability or vitality of the local shopping centre.

1 Rosebery Mews

5.6 The existing dwelling at 1 Rosebery Mews does not fall within the Local Shopping Centre Area. As such, this proposal would make a minor contribution to the overall housing target for the Borough, as well as the housing delivery target for small sites. The provision of additional residential accommodation at this site is therefore

acceptable considering its current residential function, providing all other policy objectives are met.

Design and impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

5.7 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.

5.8 London Plan Policy HC1 seeks to ensure that development proposals affecting heritage assets and their settings, should conserve their significance. This policy applies to designated and non-designated heritage assets. Local Plan Policy SP12 and DPD Policy DM9 set out the Council's approach to the management, conservation and enhancement of the Borough's historic environment.

5.9 DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

5.10 The proposals comprise a rear extension to 88 Alexandra Park Road as well as some external alterations and additions and the proposed demolition and erection of a replacement dwelling and garage located at 1 Rosebery Mews.

Rear extension & alterations – 88 Alexandra Park Road

5.11 The proposed rear extension will be of an approximate depth of 10.3m, width of 6.4m and height of 6m, sitting just below the 2nd floor rear window and on the boundary with No.90. The rear extension will cover the full depth of the rear yard of the host property and will be pulled in from the side facing Rosebery Road. Materials used in the proposed rear extension include brickwork render and cementitious

cladding boards. A sedum rooftop is proposed, and the window material includes white uPVC.

5.12 It is noted that the rear terraces of this retail parade include smaller scale extensions which are less sensitive to change considering their siting away from the junction with Rosebery Road and they are an already established part of this terrace. The proposed extension here is located in a more sensitive position considering its location facing Rosebery Road. The existing yard presents itself onto Rosebery Road and acts as a gap and transition from the high quality residential Edwardian appearance of Rosebery Road, to the busier Alexandra Park Road. This allows an appreciation of the rear of the positively contributing Nos. 88-110 and the original form of the terrace and the original urban grain. This gap is also reflected on the opposite side of Rosebery Road strengthening this characteristic and sense of transition.

5.13 The proposed extension projects beyond the depth of the existing outrigger and is not much smaller than the existing, particularly when considering the proposed roof terrace and that it would be built right up to the service road boundary. Additionally, the land levels drop from the corner of Alexandra Park Road and Rosebery Road and there is no staggering of the mass which would make it quite a dominant addition and would block any appreciation of the rear of the Alexandra Park Road terraces and the original urban grain.

5.14 There are other concerns regarding the proposed mix of materials and features which are inconsistent on the building as a whole, and within the wider Conservation Area context. Timber cladding is not appropriate in this location. The balconies proposed are oddly designed and situated, with the one servicing flat 2 in particular, half resting, half projecting over the flat entrance. Additionally, the loss of the one remaining original window with its highly decorative curved top rail sash windows on the side return, for the creation of a door would cause some harm. Similarly, the short stretch of the decorative boundary wall immediately adjacent to the existing flat entrance should be retained. The materials used in the extension would further exacerbate the incongruity of the extension, disrupting the uniformity and pattern of development to the rear terraces of this section of Alexandra Park Road.

5.15 The inappropriate size, scale, siting, massing, design and form of the proposed extension and alterations would result in the development appearing as a dominant, incongruous, out of keeping and visually intrusive addition to the street scene.

Proposed dwelling – Rosebery Mews

5.16 The proposed replacement dwelling at 1 Rosebery Mews will follow a similar pattern of development to the existing row of houses. The corner plot is also in a particularly sensitive position considering its siting on the corner with Rosebery

Road. The design of the proposed dwelling fails to consider this sensitive position by virtue of adding a second storey with a blank wall facing the street. This would result in a discordant redevelopment of the site that would fail to positively contribute to the streetscene or the CA. Therefore, the proposed dwelling will be of an inappropriate design that is out of keeping with the area and a visually intrusive addition to the street scene.

Design conclusion

5.17 Overall, the historic significance and special interest of the CA would not be preserved. The scheme would be contrary to London Plan Policies D6 and HC1, Local Plan Policies SP11 and Sp12 and DPD Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

5.18 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.

5.19 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.

88 Alexandra Park Road

5.20 The proposed rear extension at 88 Alexandra Park Road would appear bulky and overbearing. The second storey would project above the single storey neighbouring rear extension and impact on exposure to daylight and sunlight to the upper floor windows of No.90 as well as the rooflights of the rear extension. The applicant has not demonstrated on the plans that the rear extension would not be detrimental to neighbouring amenity here by virtue of an overshadowing diagram. The proposed balconies appear positioned away from neighbouring properties to avoid any potential overlooking issues. There are no windows provided that would overlook neighbouring boundaries.

1 Rosebery Mews

5.21 The proposed dwelling at 1 Rosebery Mews would reflect a similar footprint to the existing house, albeit, with the addition of a second storey on the boundary with Rosebery Road. It is proposed to be built on the boundary with No.2 Rosebery Mews and also represents a similar design to its neighbouring property. There are 4no. proposed obscure windows that look towards the rear service road behind No.88

Alexandra Park Road and as such there would be no issues with overlooking here. The proposal includes 2 no. balconies on the first floor which are positioned directly towards the flank wall window of 1 Rosebery Road. Even with the small service road separating the balcony of the proposed dwelling and 1 Rosebery Road, there would still be an element of privacy lost by virtue of direct looking into the flank window from the balconies.

5.22 Overall, the scheme would result in an adverse loss of amenity and living conditions to neighbouring residences, contrary to London Plan Policy D6 and DPD Policy DM1.

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

5.23 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.

5.24 The scheme proposes 6 no. self-contained flats that are in accordance with the London Plan GIA requirements as outlined below:

- Flat 1: 1B2P (57sqm) - London Plan requirement (50sqm) - Complies: Yes
- Flat 2: 3B4P (74sqm) - London Plan requirement (74sqm) - Complies: Yes
- Flat 3: 1B2P (51sqm) - London Plan requirement (50sqm) - Complies: Yes
- Flat 4: 3B4P (76sqm) - London Plan requirement (74sqm) - Complies: Yes
- Flat 5: 1B2P (61sqm) – London Plan requirement (58sqm) – Complies: Yes
- Flat 6: 1B2P (58sqm) – London Plan requirement (58sqm) – Complies: Yes

5.25 As such, it is considered that the dwellings would be of satisfactory size for the desired type of accommodation. The floor to ceiling heights of flats 1-4 have been provided and accord with the London Plan requirement. All dwellings also provide satisfactory storage. Each dwelling has been provided with an accessible private balcony that meets the London Plan standards. A section plan has not been provided for Flats 5 and 6, however, the ceiling heights appear suitable.

88 Alexandra Park Road

5.26 The proposed accommodation for Flats 1-4 comprise a dual aspect nature of accommodation, coupled with the provision of at least one window for each

habitable room which means that satisfactory levels of light would reach the rooms of the dwelling. Furthermore, the siting of the windows would provide adequate outlook for the future occupiers. The roof terrace/balconies would be of a size that would meet the London Plan standards. The proposal would deliver acceptable living conditions for the future occupiers for Flats 1-4.

1 Rosebery Mews

5.27 Flats 5 and 6 would have windows to their northern and southern elevations. The proposed windows on the northern elevation would be obscure-glazed, although it is not indicated on the plans that these windows are openable. A rooflight is proposed above the living room for flat 5 and it is also not indicated if this is openable. No supporting information has been provided to demonstrate that the dwelling would achieve adequate passive ventilation and that overheating would be avoided.

5.28 As such, there is a lack of information to prove that the proposal would deliver satisfactory living conditions for the future occupiers, contrary to London Plan Policy D6, local Plan Policy SP2 and DPD Policy DM12.

Inclusive access

5.29 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 require that 10% of new housing is wheelchair accessible and that the remaining 90% is easily adaptable for residents who are wheelchair users. DPD Policy DM2 also requires new developments to be designed so that they can be used safely, easily and with dignity by all.

5.30 In this particular case the proposed ground floor flat (flat 1) of the extension and Flats 5 and 6 of the new dwelling would be compliant with Part M4(2). A WC will be provided on the ground floor close to the entrance, which will be suitable for ambulant disabled use. If the application were to be approved a condition would be imposed to secure this. The proposal is therefore acceptable with regards to the policies outlined above.

Energy and sustainability

5.31 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.

5.32 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.

5.33 The application has been accompanied by an Energy Statement from Base Energy dated June 2023. The Energy Statement makes reference to the installation of Solar PV Panels and an ASHP to be installed in the new build plots, however, this is not shown on the plans. Furthermore, the plans also show a green roof which is a welcome addition, however, the submitted section does not include sufficient depth to ensure its success. A maintenance plan would be conditioned to ensure its longevity.

5.34 Overall, the Energy Statement concluded that the proposed development would result in a 49% CO₂ reduction over Part L1 2021 with a 98% CO₂ reduction from the new build elements of the development. The development also produced a 35% CO₂ reduction from low and zero carbon technologies.

Transport Considerations

5.35 London Plan Policy T1 requires developments to make most effective use of land, reflecting connectivity and accessibility by existing and future public transport, walking and cycling routes. Cumulative impacts of development on public transport and road network capacity, including walking and cycling, should be taken into account, in line with London Plan Policy T4. The Council will tackle climate change and improve transport quality/safety through: minimising congestion, promoting public transport/walking/cycling, promoting car sharing/car clubs and seeking to locate major trip generating development in locations with good access to public transport.

5.36 Developments should provide cycle parking at least in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Table 10.2 of the London Plan. The cycle parking should be fit for purpose, secure and well-located, in accordance with London Plan Policy T5. Car-free development should be the starting point for all development in places that are well-connected by public transport, in line with London Plan Policy T6. The maximum parking standards of the London Plan should be applied to development proposals. The Council will support proposals for no on-site parking where: there are alternative means of transport available, public transport accessibility level (PTAL) is at least 4 and a controlled parking zone (CPZ) exists, in accordance with DPD Policy DM32.

5.37 The Council's Transportation Team has been consulted on this application. The site is situated in an area with a PTAL rating of 2, and therefore has 'poor' access to public transport and it is also not located within a CPZ. The proposals are for a car

free development and would require the loss of an existing garage. A car free development is not considered appropriate and would usually be considered contrary to Policy DM32 of the Haringey Development Management DPD. Whilst this is acknowledged, the limited scale of the housing delivery, being only 1 additional unit for the entire development, means that significant parking demands would not arise. Furthermore, only 2 of the units appear to be family size. The proximity of services and facilities within the Alexandra Park Local Shopping Centre means that the occupiers of the proposed dwellings could access amenities via walking or cycling and therefore would be unlikely to require a vehicle. Noting these observations and given that the Transportation Officer has not objected on the basis of parking, it is not considered that the proposal would result in a significant increase in parking demand, nor would it place undue stress on parking levels in surrounding streets. If the development were to be approved, a car free s106 agreement should be secured to restrict eligibility of all occupiers from obtaining parking permits in any CPZ that may be implemented in the area in future. Moreover, the applicant should investigate provision for car club vehicles and commit to provide £100 user vouchers for a period of three years to one occupier of each dwelling. Local pavement improvements to adjacent footways and along Rosebery Mews should be secured via s106 and s278 agreements. A condition requiring submission of a construction logistic management plan prior to start of any demolition / construction works, is recommended if the application were to be approved.

5.38 According to the Design and Access statement, cycle parking is proposed to be delivered at the rear of the site, however this is not demonstrated on the plans provided and therefore, the proposal does not demonstrate that it would meet the level of cycle parking storage in accordance with London Plan requirements. Furthermore, no details have been provided to show that the cycle storage would be fit for purpose and secure. As such, it cannot be determined that the cycle parking would meet the London Cycling Design Standards. If this application were to be approved, further details on the type and design of the cycle parking would be required.

Waste & recycling

5.39 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.

5.40 Limited information has been provided on the waste and recycling arrangements, although the plans indicate there is a designated bin storage area of

6sqm next to the entrance for Flats 2, 3 and 4. Refuse storage is not mentioned for 1 Rosebery Mews. If this application were to be approved further information would have to be sought for access arrangements and details for bin storage. In addition, further details regarding the capacity of the bin sores would have been required, if this application were to be approved.

Conclusion

5.41 The proposal is considered unacceptable, as the proposed scheme would harm the character and appearance of the site, the street scene and the CA. The historic significance and special interest of the CA would not be preserved. The scheme has not provided sufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed dwelling at 1 Rosebery Mews would provide sufficient ventilation and that overheating would be avoided. The scheme would also have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity by virtue of its overbearingness, size and scale and would therefore result in harm to outlook, overlooking and loss of daylight and sunlight.

5.42 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 £15,040.15 (233sqm x £64.55) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £91,713.46 (233sqm x £393.62 (Indexation included)). 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. An informative will be attached advising the applicant of this charge.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION

1. The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate size, scale, siting, massing, form and design would appear as a dominant, incongruous, out of keeping and visually intrusive addition to the street scene, as well as the Muswell Hill Conservation Area. The unreflective proportions, massing and form of the proposed dwelling means that it would detract from the homogenous character of the locality. There would be an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the site, the surrounding area, the street scene and the Conservation Area. The historic significance and special interest of the Conservation Area would not be preserved. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to Policies D3 & HC1 of the London Plan (2021),

Policies SP11 & SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017), Policies DM1, DM7 & DM9 of the Development Management DPD (2017).

2. The proposed development, by virtue of its inappropriate size, scale, siting and design would result in harm to outlook, overbearing impacts, overlooking and loss of daylight and sunlight. The amenity, privacy and living conditions of neighbouring properties would be harmed, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021 and Policy DM1 of the Development DPD 2017.
3. The proposed dwelling at 1 Rosebery Mews would, by definition, be single aspect. Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that passive ventilation would be achieved, and that overheating would be avoided. Therefore, it has not been shown that adequate living conditions would be provided for future occupiers. The proposal would be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP2 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017 and Policy DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017.