



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2368
Application Type:	Change of use
Address:	124 Myddleton Road, Wood Green, London, N22 8NQ
Proposal:	Conversion of upper floors into 2 x 1-bed flats and first floor rear extension above existing ground floor rear projection.
Case Officer:	Roland Sheldon
Valid Date:	04/09/2023
Applicant:	Mr Youssof
Agent:	Mr Peter Goulde

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. Site location

The application site contains a three-storey mid-terrace building within a parade on the northern side Myddleton Road, N22. The ground floor of the unit is a currently vacant commercial unit that was last in use as a dry cleaners. The upper floors are understood to currently be in use as a three-bedroom flat.

The property is located within Myddleton Road Local Centre and forms part of the Bowes Park Conservation Area. The site does not contain a listed building. The property is located within a 'Family Housing Protection Zone'.

2. Description of Proposal

The original proposal sought to change the use of the currently vacant commercial unit into an extension of the existing ground floor nursery facility within nos. 126-128 (Use Class E(f)). However, this part of the application was subsequently removed from the proposal during the assessment. Following submission of revised plans, the proposal is solely with regards to conversion of the existing upper floor flat into 2 x self-contained 1-bedroom flats, with an associated first floor rear extension above the existing ground floor rear projection. Part of the existing ancillary commercial floorspace at ground floor level would be given over to residential floorspace to facilitate the conversion.

3. Relevant Planning and Enforcement history

The most recent applications for this site are summarised as follows:

124 Myddleton Road, N22

HGY/2020/1536: Change of use of ground floor shop from retail A1 to community educational and training facility (D1) and conversion of upper floors to 2 x self-contained flats, in conjunction with

first floor rear extension; installation of ground floor side windows and doors – Withdrawn 24/08/2020

124 126 + 128 Myddleton Road London N22 8NQ

HGY/2014/0823: Repairs and restoration of upper storey facades and new timber shopfronts – Approve 16/05/2014

4. Internal & Statutory Consultation

The following were consulted regarding the application:

LBH Conservation: (No objection): The rear of the site is partially visible from 124 Myddleton Road, as shown in the provided existing photos. The design of the extension is not to a particularly high standard – the proportions, features and design have little in common with the host building or its wider context and the rear and side elevations of the proposed extension are blank with no windows or detailing. This is disappointing as these elevations would be visible from Whittington Road but it does not diminish the contribution No. 124 makes to the significance of the Conservation Area, and accordingly it would have a neutral impact.

Given the blankness of the elevations, the materiality will be important to ensure this is the case. It is recommended a condition for further details for the material specification for external surfaces prior to above ground works is attached to the consent.

LBH Licensing: No comments received.

LBH Transportation Group: Objection. There is no provision of cycle parking shown on the submitted plans, contrary to London Plan standards. It would appear difficult to provide such provision on-site.

A Construction Management Plan would be required to be submitted. Details of how both residential and commercial refuse storage would be dealt with needs to be provided. Insufficient information has been provided with regards to the proposed educational use to allow a fully informed assessment of the transport implications. Due to the omission of such information, LBH Transport Planning objects to this application.

Officer comment: The comments from Transportation were based on the original submission. The revised scheme has removed the change of commercial use and altered the layout of the 2 flats from 2 x 2-bed to 2 x 1-bedroom units. Separate indicative areas for bicycle storage for each flat were shown.

Bowes Park Community Association: No comments received.

5. Local Representations

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: 0

Objecting:

Supporting:

6. Assessment of Planning Considerations

The main planning considerations raised by the proposed development are:

1. Principle of development;
2. Character, design and heritage;
3. Standard and quality of residential accommodation;
4. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
5. Transport considerations;
6. Waste management

Principle of development

Principle of additional housing

The London Plan 2021 further supports the essential need for more homes and currently has a 10-year target set for the delivery of 15,920 new dwellings between 2019/20 and 2028/29, of which 2,600 should be from small sites.

Haringey Local Plan policy SP2 outlines that the Council will aim to provide homes to meet Haringey's housing needs and to make the full use of Haringey's capacity for housing by maximising the supply of additional housing to meet and exceed the minimum target of 19,802 homes from 2011-2026.

The proposal would add one additional residential unit to the borough's housing stock, which would work towards meeting the above identified housing delivery objectives for the borough. The principle of additional housing is therefore acceptable.

Design, character and heritage

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.

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.

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.

The proposed extensions and alterations solely relate to the rear elevation of the property. The rear elevations of this particular parade of shops are non-descript in terms of their detailing and

quality, most benefitting from large unattractive commercial ground floor rear extensions. A number already benefit from two-storey L-shape rear projections.

The proposal seeks to make external refurbishments to the existing ground floor rear projection, and erect a first floor extension above. The extension would be externally clad in brick, with soldier course brick detailing above the proposed side windows. The proposed extension and alterations to the building would respect the scale, character and appearance of the host building and would preserve the character and appearance of the Bowes Park Conservation Area. A condition requiring further details of materials could be imposed if the proposal was to be recommended for approval. Subject to compliance with any such condition, the proposal would be acceptable with regards to design, character and heritage considerations.

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 criteria set out within parts c-g of part A of DMP policy DM16 largely echo some of the design aspects covered within policy D6 of the London Plan.

The proposal would see the existing property sub-divided into self-contained units as follows:

Unit no.	No. beds/persons	Floorspace (sqm)	London Plan requirement (sqm)	Amenity space provision (sqm)
1	1-bed 2-person	53.6	58	11.9 (rear courtyard)
2	1-bed 2-person	49	58	0

As can be seen from the table above, neither of the proposed units would comply with the minimum London Plan floor space size requirements for a 1-bedroom 2-person unit located over 2 floors, with both units falling well short of the minimum standards. On balance, all habitable rooms would benefit from an acceptable level of outlook and light, although the ground floor kitchen/living area of unit 1 would have a limited outlook onto the boundary wall of no. 122 2 metres away. Given that this room would benefit from a large expanse of glazing however, this would be an acceptable arrangement.

A 0.85m² storage cupboard would be provided for unit 1, although it would not appear any storage area is provided for unit 2 aside from the internal bike storage cupboard.

All of the floorspace of unit 1 would benefit from a floor-to-ceiling height of at least 2.5 metres. At 2.4 metres, whilst the majority of the floorspace of unit 2 would be slightly below the 2.5 metres floor-to-ceiling heights strongly encourage by the London Plan, given that this is a conversion of an existing building in which an existing residential unit is located, this is an acceptable provision in terms of headroom.

A 11.9m² rear courtyard area would be provided for unit 1, with no amenity space provision for unit 2. The provision in terms of size for unit 1 would exceed the 5m² requirement within the London Plan. With regards to the absence of amenity space provision for unit 2, it is very common for units

above shops within London retail parades to lack external amenity space provision, given the limited scope to provide such amenities in constrained spaces.

Given the location of the unit in an established retail parade therefore, the absence of private amenity space provision for unit 2 is on balance acceptable. However, as neither unit would meet the minimum floor space standards within the adopted London Plan, the scheme would provide a cramped sub-standard form of accommodation for future occupants of the development, contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan, policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and policy DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

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.

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.

The proposed first floor rear extension would have a depth of 5.085 metres. By virtue of the absence of windows on its rear elevation, there would be no overlooking of the rear gardens/windows of adjacent residential properties on Whittington Road.

There are first floor side windows within the proposal facing no. 122 Myddleton Road, but these are indicated to be opaque glazing serving a bathroom and landing area, and therefore would not result in an unacceptable loss of privacy for the occupants of this neighbouring property.

No detailed daylight/sunlight analysis has been provided as part of the submission or a shading study to show how the introduction of the extension would affect neighbouring properties.

Whilst they should have been submitted given the close proximity to the rear gardens of nos. 68 and 70 Whittington Road, it is acknowledged that the scale of the existing three-storey building and parade in which it is located would mean that the introduction of the relatively modest first floor addition is unlikely to give rise to an unacceptable increase in overshadowing of the neighbouring rear gardens of nos. 68-70 Whittington Road.

Likewise, given the northern aspect of the adjacent first floor rear window of no. 122 Myddleton Road, the introduction of the extension would be unlikely to result in any increase in shading or loss of light over and above the existing situation. Moreover, the adjacent first floor window is understood to serve a bathroom as shown on approved plans for application HGY/2014/1728.

The property is located within an established retail parade in which there is a denser urban grain and a more flexible approach to the introduction of new development can be applied. The introduction of the extension would reduce outlook from the adjacent first floor windows of nos. 122 and 126 Myddleton Road, but not to a degree which would warrant refusal of the proposal on amenity grounds, when considering its town centre location. Moreover, it is not known whether the adjacent first floor window of no. 126 serves a habitable room, and the window of no. 122 is understood to serve a bathroom.

As such, on balance, the proposal would not be considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupants.

Transport considerations

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.

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'.

The site benefits from a PTAL value of 4 (good) and is located within a CPZ. No off-street parking is currently available or proposed as part of the development. No parking stress survey has been submitted as part of the proposal to demonstrate existing parking stress conditions within the locality. Notwithstanding this, the proposal would remove an existing 3-bedroom unit and would replace it with 2 x 1-bedroom units, and would therefore have a negligible impact on parking conditions. The scheme would not result in the increase in 4 or more units and therefore would not be considered appropriate to be subject to a car-free agreement.

Revised plans indicate that a cycle stand would be provided within the courtyard of unit 1, with an internal storage cupboard being shown to provide a cycle storage space for unit 2 at first floor level. The submitted information fails to demonstrate accurately that sufficient space would be provided for 2 spaces for each unit, but it is considered that matter could be satisfactorily controlled by a condition that could be imposed on the development if approved. Given the location of unit 2 at upper floor level above a shop in a retail parade, internal provision is considered to be an acceptable arrangement.

A construction management plan could be secured by way of a condition imposed on the development if the proposal was to be approved, to demonstrate that the development could be undertaken whilst minimising impact on the highway network, air, dust pollution and highway safety.

Subject to compliance with such conditions, if the development was to be approved, the proposal would be considered to be acceptable with regards to highways and transportation considerations.

Waste management

DM Policy (2017) DM4 'Provision and Design of Waste Management Facilities' requires all proposals to make on-site provision for general waste, recycling and waste organic materials ensuring adequate internal and external storage space to manage the volume of waste arising from the site.

The Haringey 'Waste management guidance note for residential and mixed-use developments' sets out waste and recycling guidelines for residential and mixed-use developments within the borough.

The Council provides a waste collection service for existing flats above shops, but the waste guidance note indicates that any new dwellings should make provision for waste containment

where a development increases habitation levels. In this instance, the development would replace an existing 3-bedroom 4-person unit with 2 x 1-bed 2-person units. As such, there would be no increase in habitation levels resulting from the development. The proposal does not make provision for waste storage on-site, but given that there would be no increase in habitation level, reliance on the on-street collection service is considered to be an acceptable arrangement.

Conclusion

Whilst elements of the proposal that lack sufficient detail could be satisfied through the submission of additional information controlled by conditions imposed on the development, the proposed new self-contained units would fail to meet minimum London Plan floorspace standards and fails to provide personal storage provision for unit 2. The proposal would therefore provide a cramped, sub-standard form of accommodation for future occupants of the development, contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan, policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and policy DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.

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.

7. CIL Applicable

The increase in internal floor area would add 31.50m² of net additional gross internal area to the building used to create an additional residential unit. This would result in a Mayoral CIL charge of £1,890 (£60 x 31.5m²) and a Haringey CIL charge of £8,285.76 (£263.04 x 31.5m²).

8. Recommendation

The application is recommended for refusal for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed new self-contained units would fail to meet minimum London Plan floorspace standards and fails to provide personal storage provision for unit 2. The proposal would therefore provide a cramped, sub-standard form of accommodation for future occupants of the development, contrary to policy D6 of the London Plan, policy SP2 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and policy DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017.