



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/1989
Application Type:	Full planning permission
Address:	89 Philip Lane, Tottenham, London, N15 4JR
Proposal:	Erection of a two-storey building providing a three-bedroom house.
Case Officer:	Nathan Keyte
Valid Date:	31/08/2023
Applicant:	Mr Abraham Lipschitz
Agent:	Shulem Posen

1. PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT AND LOCATION DETAILS

Proposed development

- 1.1 Permission is sought for the construction of a detached two-storey building providing a three-bedroom house. The proposed dwelling would be sited within the private rear garden of 89 Philip Lane and set back approximately 13.0m from the existing building on the site. It is shown to have a delineated area of approximately 180 sq.m.
- 1.2 The proposed dwelling is stated within the submitted Planning Statement as being a duplicate of the existing house at no. 27 Jansons Road, located to the south of the subject site.
- 1.3 The proposed dwelling will be two-storey with a part one storey rear section. The building will have height of 7.0m, a length of approximately 10.0m, and a depth of approximately 7.70m. The dwelling is proposed to be 3b5p and has a gross internal area of 94.10 sq.m.
- 1.4 Two cars are shown within the proposed curtilage of the new dwelling. No room for reverse manoeuvring is provided. A low wall will be provided along most of the frontage, with no gate shown for the proposed vehicle entrance. No cycle storage is shown on the plans, though two refuse bins are provided adjacent to the car park area.

- 1.5 It is noted that the scale of the existing and proposed site plan drawings is not consistent with the scale bar provided on the drawings. It is understood that the proposed site area for the dwelling and its accessory areas will be 184 sqm, being approximately 18.80 sqm in length and 9.80m in depth. The northern boundary will be setback approximately 13.0m from the host building on the site, with the proposed dwelling setback approximately 20.0m from the host building on the site.

Site and Surroundings

- 1.6 The site sits on the land behind No 89 Philip Lane, a semi-detached property currently split into several apartments. The property is surrounded by private dwelling houses and other terraced houses.
- 1.7 To the west it is bordered by the garden to No 87 Philip Lane, to the east it faces Jansons Road. To the south it is bordered by the garden to No27 Jansons Road. The site is located within the Clyde Circus Conservation Area.
- 1.8 A visit was conducted to view the site from the public domain on 8 September 2023. A large expanse of white hoarding/ fencing measuring approximately 2.0m in height was observed on the eastern boundary. This feature is subject to current enforcement proceedings.

Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

- 1.9 The most recent planning history in relation to the site is as follows.
- HGY/2020/3185 | 89 Philip Lane London N15 4JR London
Erection of a two storey building providing two two-bedroom houses. No change in use.
 - HGY/2020/3184 | 89 Philip Lane London N15 4JR London
Erection of a two storey building providing one 3 bedroom house and one 2 bedroom house. No change of use. Refused.
 - HGY/2017/3048 | 89 Philip Lane London N15 4JR London
Erection of a two storey building with basement providing three three-bedroom houses. No change of use. Refused
 - Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/18/3199792 DISMISSED
 - HGY/2016/2261 | 89 Philip Lane London N15 4JR Use of property as nine self- contained flats. Grant permission
 - HGY/2012/1710 | Philip Court 89 Hornsey Lane London N6 5LN

Remove dead branches of 1 x Conifer tree. Grant permission

- HGY/2012/0495 | Philip Court 89 Hornsey Lane London N6 5LN Tree works to include crown lift to 4m of 1 x Lime Tree. Grant permission
- HGY/2012/0222 | Philip Court 89 Hornsey Lane London N6 5LN London Tree works to include crown lift to 4m of 1 x Lime tree and reduction by 20% of 1 x London Plane tree Grant permission
- HGY/2007/1906 | Philip Court, 89 Hornsey Lane Hornsey London N6 5LN London Tree works to include raising crown to 6m of 1 x London Plane tree. Grant permission
- HGY/2005/0232 | 6 Philip Court, 89 Hornsey Lane Gardens London N6 5LN London Tree works to include pruning back and crown raising to 2 x Plane trees and removal of deadwood and development of epicormic growth to 1 x Lime. Grant permission
- HGY/2000/1712 | 89 Philip Lane London N15 4JR London Conversion of an existing dwelling(hostel) to 2 self-contained flats 1 x 3 bedroom and 1 x 5 bedroom. Grant permission
- HGY/1990/0793 | 9 Philip Court 89 Hornsey Lane London N6 London Works to 2 x Plane trees and 1 Lime Tree to front of premises and 1 Lime tree to rear. Grant permission
- OLD/1976/1080 | 89 Philip Lane N15 9/1/76 Conversion to residential house to young adults. Grant permission

- 1.10 There is an existing enforcement case relating to the unauthorised works of the boundary wall, which has been appealed.

2. CONSULTATION RESPONSE

- 2.1 The responses below were received following consultation on the application:

Internal:

1) LBH Transportation Team: Objection, unless the development is made car free with no on-site carparking. Further detailed comments are integrated into the assessment in the report below.

2) LBH Carbon Management: No response.

3) LBH Conservation Officer: Insufficient information provided, and it is not possible to support in its current configuration.

The rear garden of property at 89 Philip Lane, a positive contributor to the character of the area, have been together with its London stock brick boundary wall, now entirely boarded up, an established and defining element of the character of the Conservation Area along Jansons road. The leafy rear gardens that separate the houses fronting Philip Lane from the houses fronting Janson road and the open views from Jansons Road into these rear gardens are integral part of the well-preserved, original urban design of the area and should be respected and retained.

It is proposed to erect a two-storey building providing a three-bedroom house.

The application does not include any comprehensive street frontage elevation and no cross-section drawings through the site to fully illustrate the proposed building within its built historic context.

The heritage statement does not sufficiently articulate the heritage significance of the site and its conservation area setting.

The scant heritage impact assessment does not rest on any sound assessment of significance and street views evidence to test the impact of the proposed building on the heritage setting of the Conservation Area.

The application does not provide a sufficient level of detail that should be proportionate to the importance of the Conservation Area, and it so therefore not possibly understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of heritage assets.

The application is therefore contrary both to the requirements of NPPF paragraph 194 and to the requirements of local policy DM9.

The boarding up of the brick boundary wall, intended as a conservation area feature raises concerns about its conditions.

The footprint of the proposed development and related parking space would largely erode the existing amenity and habitat value of the rear garden by occupying almost half of its surface and this raises concerns for the historic character of the site.

It is also unclear what are the architectural references for the design of the proposed building, how it relates to the main house and the buildings along Philips lane, it is ultimately unclear and how it will impact the conservation area townscape and it is therefore not possible to support the application in its current configuration.

External:

Clyde Area Residents Association – no comment

3. LOCAL REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 The application has been publicised by way of a site notice, public advert and letters. There were no number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, in response to notification and publicity of the application.

4. MATERIAL PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:
1. Principle of development,
 2. Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area,
 3. Standard and quality of residential accommodation,
 4. Impact on neighbouring amenity,
 5. Transport considerations,
 6. Inclusive Access
 7. Waste and recycling
 8. Energy and sustainability, and
 9. Heritage Balance.

Principle of development

- 4.2 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).
- 4.3 London Plan Policy D3 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.
- 4.4 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.
- 4.5 As outlined in the previous applications on this site, the principle of residential development is considered acceptable at this location, given the existing residential use. However, the acceptability of any such proposal to sub-divide the existing plot will be based upon the design of the scheme meeting the provisions of Council's DPD (2017) policies and adopted London Plan (2021).

- 4.6 In particular, DM Policy DM7 relates to infill and garden sites and states that: There will be a presumption against the loss of garden land unless it represents comprehensive redevelopment of a number of whole land plots. Development proposals for infill, backland and garden land should:
- 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;
 - f Incorporate at least one street frontage or be ancillary to the host dwelling and the adjacent houses/terraces;
- 4.7 Any development must comply with all of these requirements to be considered acceptable.
- 4.8 The Officer report relating to the refused application HGY/2020/3185 (post-appeal) noted that 'given the depth of the site and it's relationship with Jansons Road, a small, discreet development which responds to the character and appearance of the conservation area as well as accepting the narrow width and constraints of the site could be considered acceptable'.
- 4.9 The current proposal has reduced the number of dwellings from previous schemes to a single 3 bedroom dwelling, although with on-site parking. However, the design of the building, being two-storey and with a design that replicates that of No. 27 Jansons Road is not considered to be a discreet development responding to the character and appearance of the conservation area. This is discussed further below.

Appeal

- 4.10 Appeal (Ref:APP/Y5420/W/18/3199792) for the Erection of a two-storey building with basement providing 3 x 3-bedroom houses was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. The conclusions of the appeal related to:

- Whether or not the character or appearance of the Clyde Circus Conservation Area would be preserved or enhanced; and
- The effect on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers having particular regard to outlook.

4.11 These issues are addressed below.

Impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area

- 4.12 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.
- 4.13 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.
- 4.14 Within the aforementioned appeal, the Inspector stated that 'the proposed scale and design of the dwellings would be acceptable'. However, the Inspector states that:

'The dwellings' footprint would fill the gap between the common boundary with No 27 (Jansons Road) and the rear boundary to the garden of No 89 (Philip Lane) leaving minimal space between the dwellings and site boundaries and resulting in a cramped form of development which would be harmful to the spacious and verdant character which contributes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The loss of the visual break between the larger properties on Philip Road and the more modest development on Jansons Road would be harmful to the historic layout of development which contributes to the character and appearance and the significance of the Conservation Area'.

4.15 Continuing, the Inspector states that,

'Whilst the appeal dwellings would be comparable in scale and appearance with the new dwellings at Nos 17 and 18, they are directly adjacent to existing dwellings and the circumstances of that site are not directly comparable with the appeal scheme before me. For the reasons outlined above, the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Clyde Circus Conservation Area'.

- 4.16 Given the Inspector's emphasis on the loss of the visual break between the larger properties on Philip Road and the more modest development on Jansons Road, the addition of this two-storey dwelling as proposed is considered to be harmful to the historic layout of development which contributes to the character and appearance and the significance of the Conservation Area.
- 4.17 The current proposal has however provided greater distance from the host property than previous refused schemes to the proposed dwelling, being approximately 20m, although will be only approximately 13.0m from the host building to the proposed vehicle entrance to the site. In the Delegated Report for refusal of HGY/2020/3185, Officers considered that one dwelling that would be comparable in form to an outbuilding may be more acceptable. The Applicant has chosen not to follow this recommendation, nor have they participated in pre-application discussions on this particular scheme.
- 4.18 Furthermore, the current proposal will erode over half of the garden space from the host property at 89 Philip Lane and, along with the boundary treatment and wide vehicle access proposed, would dominate as an architectural anomaly in street views of the Conservation Area from the junction with Philip Lane and from both directions along Jansons Road contributing to a sense of overdevelopment of the site in the context of the original site.
- 4.19 With regards to the acceptability of the design proposed for the development, the Conservation Officer has noted a lack of detail proportionate to the importance of the Conservation Area (such as the Heritage Statement not sufficiently articulating the heritage significance) considering the application involves the creation of a new dwelling and changes to the streetscape.
- 4.20 The design of the proposed building is noted within the submitted Planning Statement to duplicate that of no. 27 Jansons Road. The particular building design is not common within Jansons Road, where townhouses including the existing building on the property are commonly comprised of yellow brick. It is ultimately unclear why this transposition of building design was selected to

model in the proposed design, and no thorough rational or assessment has been provided with the application to support this.

- 4.21 The current enforcement case, which is noted as being appealed, is understood to relate to the original brick boundary wall being removed and replaced by wooden hoarding. The application and its impacts upon the streetscape is therefore to be considered with the original brick wall in mind. With regard to the treatment of the front boundary, it is proposed to reduce the height of the existing boundary brick wall, and provide an approximately 4.5m wide gap to facilitate vehicle access. While low front walls are noted within Jansons Road, considering the existing high brick wall along the boundary that links 89 Philip Lane and 27 Jansons Road, with the proposal effectively forming a large break between high brick walls, this will contribute to incongruous front boundary treatment that is considered to negatively impact the streetscene, detracting from the character of the area.
- 4.22 Considering the points above, Officers consider that, as outlined in the previous refusal of HGY/2020/3185 the proposed building would intrude with its scale and massing in the undeveloped openness that characterise the northern section of Jansons Road just on the edge of the Conservation Area. The proposed development would also erode half of the deep, yet narrow rear garden of property at 89 Philip Lane and would dominate as an architectural anomaly in street views of the Conservation Area from the junction with Philip Lane and from both directions along Jansons Road.
- 4.23 As such, the proposal is not considered to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to the above policies, and is considered to result in less than substantial harm on the Conservation Area.

Standard and quality of residential accommodation

- 4.24 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.
- 4.25 The 2 storey dwelling will be 3b5p with a gross internal floor area of 94 sq.m (London Plan 2021 requirement being 93 sq.m). Based on the height of the building and elevations provided, the internal floor to ceiling height is likely

to meet the requirement of the London Plan (2021), although cross sections would have been requested to confirm this were the application otherwise considered to be acceptable.

- 4.26 Confirmation of outdoor living space would also have been requested, though considering the area of the site proposed this is likely to be achieved. However, the quality and outlook of the outdoor living space would be a matter of concern, considering the presence of the on-site parking and depths to boundary fences, and additional details would be required before this aspect of the design is considered acceptable.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

- 4.27 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.
- 4.28 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.
- 4.29 Within the aforementioned appeal the Inspector states that states that:

'Due to their proximity to the fence on the common boundary with No 91, height and overall massing, the proposed dwellings would dominate views from the rear garden of No 91 and would appear overbearing, increasing the sense of enclosure and worsening the outlook from the garden. The existing fence on the common boundary will already cast some shadow over No 91's rear garden. However, the proposal would result a greater mass of building in close proximity to the boundary, shadowing a large part of the garden during the morning period. Levels of daylight and sunlight to the garden area would be reduced significantly, causing material harm to the living conditions that the occupiers could reasonably expect'.

- 4.30 Whilst the development proposed within this application has been reduced to one dwelling (from three previously considered at appeal), the proposal is still significant, with the main structure having a height of 7.0m, with the ground floor having a length of 10.0m and the first floor section having a length of 9.0m. This is very large in the context of, what essentially is a rear garden, on a prominent corner, in conservation area.
- 4.31 The proposed dwelling, whilst reduced would, therefore still have a significant impact as did the previously refused proposals. At two storeys and in close proximity to the boundary fence, the proposed development would be highly visible from the the existing flats at No.89 Philip Lane. Similarly, the proposal would also be highly visible from No.27 Jansons Road whose rear boundary adjoins the south side of the proposal.
- 4.32 The proposal due to its location, size and massing would be overbearing in relation to these sites, therefore being harmful to neighbouring amenity. The proposal development would also represent overdevelopment in relation to the area of the site and the properties in the locality.

Transport considerations

- 4.33 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.
- 4.34 Local Plan 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 DPD Policy DM31 'Sustainable Transport'.
- 4.35 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'.

- 4.36 DPD Policy DM33 'Crossovers, vehicular access and adopting roads' states that the Council will only support a proposal for a crossover or new vehicle access where it is demonstrated that the proposal does not result in:
- a) A reduction in pedestrian or highway safety; or
 - b) A reduction of on-street parking capacity within a Controlled Parking Zone; or
 - c) A visual intrusion to the street scene.
- 4.37 The Council's Transportation Team has been consulted and advises that it has a PTAL value of 3, considered 'moderate' access to public transport services, and located within a CPZ. Two cars are shown parked on the proposed plans submitted. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 4.38 The published London Plan 2021 Policy T6.1 Residential Parking requires that development proposals must comply with the relevant parking standards. For a development of this type, a 3 bedroom dwelling with a PTAL ranking of 3, the maximum number of car parking spaces permitted would be 0.75no., therefore the 2no. proposed would not be in accordance with this policy. No provision for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles is provided, however this aspect could be conditioned were the application otherwise acceptable.
- 4.39 A visit to the site revealed the presence of on-street parking, a cycle storage hanger, and street tree adjacent to the site. A review of the submitted block plan shows that the proposed vehicle crossover would conflict with these elements. The introduction of any vehicle crossover in this location will take away from on road parking supply in a CPZ, either directly or as a result of the need to relocate the cycle hanger, and where no parking stress survey was submitted with the application detailing local parking levels in the vicinity of the site. In the absence of a parking stress survey and additional information relating to the details of the vehicle crossing, the proposed vehicle crossover does not accord with the relevant policies relating to new crossovers.
- 4.40 No onsite cycle parking is identified on the plans submitted. This aspect would have been conditioned were the application otherwise considered acceptable. The requirement for a Construction Management Plan to be submitted would also have been subject to a condition.

- 4.41 Insufficient information has been provided with the application to demonstrate that the proposal will not result in significant harm to the CPZ and highway safety. However, this matter could be demonstrated via the provision of a Car Parking Survey were the application otherwise acceptable.

Inclusive access

- 4.42 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.
- 4.43 In this particular case the development would not be compliant with M4(1) as it does not provide a water closet at entrance/ ground floor level.

Waste and recycling

- 4.44 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.
- 4.45 The proposed drawings indicate bins will be provided adjacent to the car parking area. Additional details regarding bin enclosures considering the site is within a conservation area would be a condition of consent were the application otherwise found to be acceptable.

Energy and sustainability

- 4.46 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.

- 4.47 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.
- 4.48 The Energy Statement submitted with application concludes that the installation of an air source heat pump in combination with enhanced fabric and energy efficient systems and a cash in lieu contribution of £1,262 would be required to achieve 100% reduction in regulated CO₂ emissions.
- 4.49 It is questioned why additional measures such as photovoltaics are not able to be utilised within the development considering the area of proposed roof space. Furthermore, considering that the site is located within a Conservation Area how the air source heat pump would be integrated into the design of the building would need to be better understood, in order to determine whether this aspect of the development would be acceptable.
- 4.50 Subject to these matters being clarified, the proposal would be considered to accord with the policy SP4 of the London Plan (2021), Local Plan Policy SP4 and DPD Policy DM21.

Heritage Balance

- 4.51 A previous section of this report has concluded that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the CA. Whilst this is noted, the localised nature of the impacts means that, in the context of the whole CA, the harm would be 'less than substantial'. In such circumstances, paragraph 208 of the NPPF notes that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. In this case, the scheme would provide for an additional dwelling.
- 4.52 Within the aforementioned appeal, the Inspector attached 'considerable importance and weight to the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area', concluding that the heritage harm identified would outweigh the public benefits in support of the scheme and the appeal proposal would fail to comply with the Framework with regard to the conservation of designated heritage assets. The provision of car parking beyond the maximum number envisioned by the London Plan also weighs against the scheme.
- 4.53 Whilst the impact of the proposal would be relatively localised and the harm to the Conservation Area identified above would be less than substantial, the LPA do not consider that the current planning application changes the

previous conclusion of the Inspector, with public benefits that do not outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.

Conclusion

- 4.54 The proposed development by reason of its design, form and siting, coupled with the large opening for the purposes of off-street parking would represent a dominant and incongruous form of development, at odds with the spatial and verdant characteristics afforded by this garden site, the street-scene and the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area, contrary to Policies HC1 and D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1, DM7 and DM9 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).
- 4.55 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).
- 4.56 The provision of two car parking spaces would exceed the maximum requirements and would not be in accordance with London Plan (2021) Policy T6.1
- 4.57 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.

5. 5. CIL APPLICABLE

The development is less than 100 square metres but is for a whole new unit and as such is liable for CIL. Based on the information given on the plans, the Mayoral CIL charge will be £5,640.00 (94 sqm x £60) and the Haringey CIL charge will be £5,025.24 (94sqm x £53.46 (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.

6. 6. RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PERMISSION for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed development by reason of its design, form and siting, coupled with the large opening for the purposes of off-street parking would represent a dominant and incongruous form of development, at odds with the spatial and verdant characteristics afforded by this garden site, the street-scene and the character and appearance to this part of the conservation area, contrary to Policies HC1 and D3 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1, DM7 and DM9 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017).
2. 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).
3. The provision of two car parking spaces would exceed the maximum requirements and would not be in accordance with London Plan (2021) Policy T6.