



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2023/2653		
Application Type:	Full planning permission		
Address:	St Matthews Court 7b, Coppetts Road, Hornsey, London, N10 1NW		
Proposal:	Construction of a new residential building (use class C3), together with landscaping, cycle and car parking, and associated works.		
Case Officer:	Ben Coffie		
Valid Date:	06/06/2024		
Applicant:	-		
Agent:	Mr Joseph Oakden		

1. Site Description

- 1.1 The application site comprises a three-storey block of flats located alongside Coppetts Road, with a wing extending from the rear elevation. The building is set under pitched roofs, with brick elevations and there is an ordered pattern of fenestration to the elevation addressing the road. The building is set back from Coppetts Road with a generous landscaped frontage. There is an extensive car park to the north and the site benefits from a large area of landscaping to the south and rear laid with grass with some perimeter trees and shrubs. The proposal here relates to the rear of the site.
- 1.2 The surrounding topography results in levels falling to the north, with the road and nearby dwellings following this contour. The area surrounding the site is generally characterised by low-rise development, comprising of two-storey dwellings lining the majority of the adjoining roads.

2. Relevant Planning and Enforcement History

- 2.1 The planning history in relation to the site is as follows:

HGY/2021/0949,

Address: St Matthews Court, 7b, Coppetts Road, London, N10 1NW

Proposal: Prior approval for the construction of two additional storeys to provide nine new dwellinghouses above St Matthews Court under Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (amended 2020),

Decision Date: 13 May 2021

Decision: Refuse, subsequently appealed under appeal reference: APP/Y5420/W/21/3278847, Appeal decision – dismissed

HGY/2022/1796,

Address: St Matthews Court, 7b, Coppetts Road, London, N10 1NW

Proposal: Prior approval for the construction of one additional storey of residential floorspace immediately above the top floor of the principal part of the building (taken as the whole roof). The proposed additional storey would deliver eight new dwellings, comprised of 4 x 1b/1p and 4 x 1b/2p above St Matthews Court under Part 20, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (amended 2020),

Decision Date: 11 August 2022

Decision: Refused, subsequently appealed under appeal reference: APP/Y5420/W/22/3308350 Appeal allowed.

3. Consultation Response

3.1 The following were consulted on the planning application:

- LBH Transportation Team: - No response
- LBH Design Officer: - No response

3.2 The number of representations received from neighbours, local groups, etc in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

- Objecting: 70
- Supporting: 0
- Representation: 0

Note: No of individual responses: 70 (some of these includes multiple responses from the same representatives in relation to the consultation and initial/revised scheme).

3.2 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:

Procedural issues/ Principle of development

- Inappropriate garden land development.
- loss of greenspace.

Design & appearance

- Unsympathetic, overly dominant proposal.
- inconsistent and out of character with the surrounding character.
- Overdevelopment of site.
- Incompatible balconies.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

- Development is large and overbearing.
- Overlooking and impacts to privacy to Mo's 7-22 Nelson Mandela Close and No 52-60 Creighton Avenue.
- Loss of light and overshadowing to residents of Block D and private garden of No 52-60 Creighton Avenue.
- Noticeable reduction of light to the north facing windows of Block D.
- Daylight and sunlight assessment appears to not show any impact on the west facing windows in block D.
- Outlook from and light received by the windows will be affected given they will directly face the proposed four storey development.
- Increase in noise and general disturbances due to increase in flats.
- Perceived loss of privacy due to residents potentially using narrow path between the new development and Block D.
- Landscape enhancements do not respect the privacy or defensible space of residents, and the proposed external staircase will also give rise to privacy concerns.
- Development will give rise to overlooking and overbearing impact to dwellings at Nelson Mandela Court (NMC) to the north and fronting Creighton Avenue to the south given these dwellings are lower in height and due to balconies proposed.
- Concerns are raised about the substantial impact that the construction works both the approved upward single storey extension and current application proposals.

Environmental/ sustainability/ flood risk issues

- Loss of trees, vegetation, and wildlife due to loss of greenspace/garden.
- Proposal requires removing a significant part of the garden, contrary to policy.

Transport, parking and construction

- Insufficient car parking provision exacerbating parking stress and impact on public highway.
- Access to garden from other flats would be narrow.
- Spaces within the undercroft area look relatively difficult to access and it is suggested that that vehicle tracking be provided to Council review.
- No elevations of bike storage or enclosure is provided.
- Not clear how the proposed block would be constructed, whilst allowing residents access to the existing car park which would require a contractor's compound for the during the construction works.

Open space and trees

- The proposed reconfiguration of the open space would result in the loss/reduction of open grassed area.
- No information is provided regarding the loss of tree and no Arboricultural Implications Assessment and tree survey.

4. Material Planning Considerations

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

1. Principle of development;
2. Design and appearance;
3. Standard & quality of accommodation;
4. Inclusive access;
5. Impact on neighbouring amenity;
6. Tree and landscaping;
7. Parking & transport
8. Energy & Sustainability;
9. Waste and recycling.

Principle of development

Supply of housing

- 4.2 Providing additional residential units is consistent in respect of Government, London and local plan policies in respect of increasing housing supply and higher levels of density in relation to accessible locations, with both the 2023 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and London Plan putting particular emphasis on 'small site' development.
- 4.3 Paragraph 73 of the NPPF (July 2024) recognises the importance of small and medium sized sites can make in meeting the housing requirement of an area, with these often built-out relatively quickly. Chapter 11 supports the effective use of land. Paragraph 135c seeks to secure development which is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities).
- 4.4 The London Plan (2021) sets out housing targets for London over the coming decade, setting a 10-year housing target (2019/20 - 2028/29) for Haringey of 15,920, equating to 1,592 dwellings per annum. Policy H1 of the London Plan 'Increasing housing supply' states that boroughs should optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites. Policy H2A of the London Plan outlines a clear presumption in favour of development proposals for small sites such as this (below 0.25 hectares in size). It states that they should play a much greater role in housing delivery and boroughs should pro-actively support well-designed new homes on them to significantly increase the contribution of small sites to meeting London's housing needs. It sets out (table 4.2) a minimum target to deliver 2,600 homes from small sites in Haringey over a 10-year period. It notes that local character evolves over time and would need to change in appropriate locations to accommodate more housing on small sites.

- 4.5 The Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies DPD 2017 (SPDPD), sets out the long-term vision of the development of Haringey by 2026 and sets out the Council's spatial strategy for achieving that vision. Policy SP2 states that the Council would 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 stated minimum target. The supporting text to Policy SP2 of the Local Plan specifically acknowledges the role these 'small sites' play towards housing delivery.
- 4.6 Taking account of the above, the provision of additional dwellings in this location is considered acceptable in principle, subject to addressing other material planning considerations, as discussed further on in this report.

Garden/Infill development

- 4.7 The local plan has a specific policy on backland, infill and garden land development. Policy DM7 of the Development Management DPD states that there would 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 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;
 - f. Incorporate at least one street frontage or be ancillary to the host dwelling and the adjacent houses/terraces; and
 - g. Not result in 'gated' developments that prevent access which would normally be provided by a publicly accessible street.
- 4.8 The proposed development is viewed to be contrary to Policy DM7(a) as would fail to relate appropriately and sensitively to the surrounding area and pattern of development. The four-storey building would be taller and bulkier than the existing structure/ block on site, as such creating a visually dominant form of development that would disrupt the character of the site with equally an awkward spatial relationship between the proposed building and surrounding properties.

- 4.9 In terms of DM7(b), the proposal does not provide a site-specific or creative response to the built and natural features of the area. The loss of a large portion of the communal garden space, which was originally intended to act as a green buffer between buildings, disregards the existing spatial development pattern. Instead of enhancing the area's character, the development intensifies the built form in a way that is inconsistent with the surrounding suburban setting.
- 4.10 Regarding DM7(d), the introduction of a four-storey block adjacent to No. 52 Creighton Avenue's private garden would compromise privacy and amenity to the occupiers of this property. As discussed further below in this report the proposal would introduce significant overlooking.
- 4.11 The proposal is viewed to be contrary to policy DM7(f), as it does not incorporate a street frontage nor function as an ancillary development to the host dwelling or adjacent houses. Instead, it would introduce a sizeable and bulky building into an area originally intended as a garden and buffer with neighbouring suburban development, as such at odds with the character and pattern of development to the surrounding neighbourhood.
- 4.12 Overall, the proposed development is viewed inconsistent with multiple aspects of Policy DM7. Its scale, siting and design would fail to respect the character of the surrounding area and neighbouring amenity and privacy, with it amounting to an overdevelopment of this site.

Design & appearance

Policy overview

- 4.13 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.
- 4.14 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.
- 4.15 The proposed development would consist of a four-storey residential building incorporating an undercroft car park at ground level and six residential units (6 x 1 bed,

2 people). The layout would introduce a staggered 'T-shape' series of blocks within the site. However, the arrangement of the proposed block would appear cramped and contrived due to the site's constraints. In particular, the spatial relationship between the new building, the nearest existing block, and neighbouring properties would be awkward. The placement of this block within what is currently a garden space would disrupt the existing spatial buffer, intensifying the built form on this site in a manner that is viewed to be inconsistent with the established development pattern of the area.

- 4.16 The architectural design of the proposed block reflects the existing residential buildings in terms of materials, with red brick facades, a gable roof, and a fenestration pattern similar to the surrounding blocks. While this consistency is acknowledged, the proposed design introduces significant issues regarding access and integration. The external staircase serving as the main entrance would create a convoluted and poorly defined access arrangement. Although level access is technically achieved via a lift from the undercroft car park, the lack of a clear and welcoming front entrance would result in poor legibility. This misalignment with the existing blocks would contribute to an unsafe and unwelcoming approach for future occupants.
- 4.17 Additionally, the integration of car parking within the northern elevation appears awkward and unconvincing. The undercroft parking does not successfully merge with the overall site context, further reinforcing concerns that the scheme constitutes an overdevelopment.
- 4.18 The introduction of this new block into what is currently a communal garden area has material implications for landscaping and the character of the site. The garden space was originally designed to provide separation and transition between the flatted blocks and the neighbouring suburban housing to the rear, to in effect reinforce the area's established spatial development pattern of large gardens and space between buildings.
- 4.19 The insertion of a new residential block within this space disregards this established character and would negatively impact the amenity of adjacent properties. The height of this scheme further reinforces such concerns. Specifically, while it is noted there is an extant scheme permitting an additional floor on the existing street facing block, it has not been implemented. As a result, this proposed block's height to the rear would exceed that of the surrounding buildings, as such exacerbating its visual dominance within the site.
- 4.20 Furthermore, the additional built form would increase the visual dominance of St Matthew's Court in relation to neighbouring dwellings and gardens. The result is a scheme that appears overdeveloped, intrusive, and incongruous within its context.
- 4.21 While the current rear garden is not extensively landscaped the spatial changes to the site do represent a substantial reduction in soft landscaping, replaced with hard some surfaces and the footprint of the new building. This transformation would harm the

garden setting and sense of openness as the rear of the existing blocks and reduce the overall green buffer between buildings.

- 4.22 Overall, the scheme is not considered acceptable in terms of layout, siting and scale with it viewed to result in a cramped and contrived development in the context of the constraints of this site, with the loss of garden space, thus representing an overdevelopment of this site, detrimental to the character and appearance of this area.

Standard & quality of accommodation

- 4.23 London Plan (2021) 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 government's 2015 'Technical housing standards – nationally described space standard' (NDSS) is also relevant.
- 4.24 The development would provide 6 new residential units, with the size of such units meeting the minimum area standards as required by the London Plan, with each unit including a living room, kitchen diner and WC at ground floor level, along with amenity space to the front and rear. The proposed units would be dual aspect and would be well lit in terms of daylight and sunlight.
- 4.25 The application is supported by a daylight and sunlight assessment which has assessed the internal light levels within the proposed units. This assessment shows that the provision of natural daylight would meet or exceed the requirements set out within the BRE guidelines.
- 4.26 All properties within the development have been designed in accordance with the internal space requirements of the Mayor's Housing SPG Standard 24 and the Nationally Described Space Standards. In terms of amenity space provision all properties have balconies at least 5sqm in size.

Inclusive access

- 4.27 London Plan policies D5 and D7 require new developments to prioritise accessible and inclusive design, ensuring that all residents would be able to use spaces with ease and dignity. Specifically, Policy D7 would mandate that 10% of new housing be wheelchair accessible, while the remaining 90% would need to be adaptable for wheelchair users. These requirements aim to create an inclusive environment that can accommodate people with mobility needs.
- 4.28 In compliance with these policies, the proposed flats would be designed to meet the relevant accessibility standards of current building regulations. The development

would feature two core access points—one from the eastern main entrance connected to an existing path and another from the undercroft parking area, which would provide direct access from designated disabled parking spaces. The internal layout would include features such as level thresholds and appropriately sized entrances and circulation spaces to facilitate ease of movement for wheelchair users.

- 4.29 Despite meeting technical accessibility requirements, and as already discussed above, there are concerns regarding the development's entrance design. While the undercroft car park would provide level access via a lift, the absence of a clear and welcoming front entrance is viewed to affect the overall legibility, important in terms of inclusive access.
- 4.30 The misalignment with existing blocks is viewed to contribute to an unsafe and uninviting approach, potentially impacting the experience of future residents as such being poor design and at odds with the policies outlined above.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

- 4.31 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.
- 4.32 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.
- 4.33 As reflected above, this application has given rise to a sizeable number of objections from existing residents within St. Matthew's Court and adjoining sites. As already discussed, concerns have been raised about placing such a large building in a backland location, particularly regarding amenity, as well as the loss of openness and separation between buildings.
- 4.34 As part of the application, a Daylight and Sunlight Assessment was prepared by Herrington Consulting. This analysis outlines that the development will not have a materially harmful impact on neighbouring properties in terms of daylight and sunlight conditions.
- 4.35 In this case, the most affected residential units are within St. Matthew's Court, specifically Block D, as Blocks A–C are at an adequate distance. Block D, the closest structure, would be separated from the new development by a maximum of 2 meters. Due to this close proximity and the forward projection of the new block beyond the

existing front building line, Block D's side windows would be partially affected. Block D features three windows (one per floor of the three-story building) on its western side, where the proposed development would be located.

- 4.36 The submitted daylight and sunlight assessment has been conducted in accordance with BRE criteria, which state that a Vertical Sky Component (VSC) of at least 27% should be retained after the development. If the existing VSC is below 27%, the post-development VSC should be no less than 80% of its former value. When multiple windows serve the same room, the BRE guidelines recommend calculating a weighted average for each window's VSC results.
- 4.37 A total of 18 rooms in Block D were tested. According to the daylight assessment, the weighted average VSC results for the ground-floor and first-floor rooms of Block D fall marginally below the 0.8 BRE recommendation. While this indicates some degree of daylight loss, the assessment justifies that there are no additional impacts, as results were taken precisely from the areas where the proposed development was expected to have an effect.
- 4.38 Although the proposal marginally complies with BRE numerical daylight standards, it nonetheless represents a diminution in living conditions, with further harm arising from the overbearing impact of the building's siting in relation to Block D's front and side windows. Specifically, the outlook and aspect from Block D's nearest front windows, which have been well-established and enjoyed for many years, will be affected—resulting in harm to residential amenity. Given that these conditions are long-standing and currently enjoyed by residents, their protection is considered important
- 4.39 The proximity of the proposed block to the garden of No. 52 Creighton Avenue is a specific concern, as the development imposes a significant change on the amenity of its occupiers. The introduction of a large building with associated balconies and windows would create significant overlooking, radically affecting the nearest garden and those further westward.
- 4.40 Regarding Nos. 7–22 Nelson Mandela Close to the north, while the development will be visible from the gardens and upper-floor windows of these properties, its impact will be less significant but still notable. The windows on the elevation facing these properties are set back sufficiently from the boundary, and their 90-degree orientation prevents direct overlooking. However, despite this, the height and associated balconies are still viewed as having a negative impact on privacy. Typically, a four-story building would be expected to be positioned further from such a boundary, which is also a clear concern for No. 52 at the rear.
- 4.41 Overall, the proposed development due to its siting and layout would harm light conditions, outlook, and privacy for neighbouring properties. The scale and positioning of the block in relation to adjoining properties and gardens would result in intrusive overlooking, loss of privacy, and an overbearing presence.

Trees & Landscaping

- 4.42 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 would expect development proposals to respond to trees on and close to the site.
- 4.43 As reflected above, the scheme would result in the loss of garden space and a reduction in the size of the communal garden for this plot. The applicant argues that they would provide a more attractive and usable area than the current grassed space. While it is not disputed that further landscaping on-site could benefit residents, this does not outweigh the loss of openness and the sense of space, which are equally important aspects of the current site configuration.
- 4.44 The scheme is not supported by an Arboricultural Implications Assessment, nor does the area where the building would stand contain trees. However, it is noted that a tree has been removed from the site, specifically to the south of the block. It is understood that the tree in question was neither subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) nor is the site located within a conservation area. As such its removal is not controlled by the Local Planning Authority. However, in the event that this application was approved, compensatory tree planting should be secured to address the loss of this tree
- 4.45 Regarding Mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), which has applied to minor applications submitted from April 2024 onward, this application was submitted prior to that date. Therefore, the submission of a BNG plan or metric is not a formal requirement in its determination.

Parking & transport

- 4.46 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.
- 4.47 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'.

- 4.48 The site has a maximum public transport accessibility level (PTAL) of 2, which is considered to be a poor level of access. The site is not located within the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) therefore there are no restrictions on on-street parking. Within TfL's WEBCAT/PTAL walk distance criteria there is one bus service accessible from the site, within 2 to 6 minutes' walk. The site is approximately a 25-minute walk from East Finchley underground station and 38 mins from Alexandra Palace Train Station. As such in practice it is not considered a reasonable walking distance for many people to access train services.
- 4.49 Given the development would provide 1bed flats rather than family dwellings, it is likely that future occupiers of the unit would use sustainable modes of transport for many of their day-to-day journeys. As per the submitted planning statement, the parking demand arising from the six 1 bedroom flats in the new block is catered for in the undercroft car park of 5 spaces. With the increase in capacity of the existing car park due to its reconfiguration by one, a total of 26 car parking spaces are provided across the site. This includes 2 wheelchair accessible spaces. Together the undercroft car park and reconfigured car park would meet the demands of the existing and future residents, including the flats in the additional floor, and any overspill parking on to surrounding roads that might arise would not be at a level that is unacceptable.
- 4.50 In terms of cycle parking 33 cycle parking spaces across the site, comprised of 25 spaces within a new store adjacent to the reconfigured parking area and 8 spaces contained within the undercroft parking area. The proposals therefore result in a net increase of 27 cycle parking spaces from the existing position. This is considered an acceptable arrangement however details of the enclosure would be secured under the imposition of a condition
- 4.51 A condition securing a construction management plan would be imposed if this application was being approved as well as conditions imposed securing exact detail in respect of the cycle parking and the altered parking layout.

Energy and sustainability

- 4.52 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.
- 4.53 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.

- 4.54 An Energy & Sustainability Statement produced by Cooper Homewood. The document has been reviewed by the Carbon Management team which indicates that the proposed Energy and Sustainability strategy would achieve a 76% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions on-site through enhanced fabric efficiency, MVHR, air-source heat pumps for hot water, and 12kWp solar panels for on-site renewable energy generation. This strategy is supported in principle however if permission were granted, further clarification would be required on certain aspects of the energy and sustainability strategy.

Waste and recycling

- 4.55 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.
- 4.56 The development would provide additional waste storage capacity within a new enclosed bin store within the undercroft parking area to serve the residents of the new dwellings. This area would accommodate 2no. 1,100lt Eurobins and 1no. 360lt wheelie bin in accordance with the Council's Sustainable Design & Construction SPD.
- 4.57 Refuse would be collected through the same refuse vehicle/ arrangements that collects refuse for the site with waste collectors entering the site to collect the bins from the relevant bin stores.
- 4.58 As such in terms of waste and recycling the scheme here would provide acceptable arrangements.

Community Infrastructure Levy

- 4.74 In the event that this application was approved the scheme the scheme would be subject to Community Infrastructure Levy - Mayoral CIL charge would be £39,578.64 (556.74qm x £71.09) and the Haringey CIL charge would be £241,369.06 (556.74sqm x £433.54).

Conclusion

- 4.59 In summary proposed development by virtue of its design, layout, siting, and scale, would appear cramped and contrived within the constraints of the site, resulting in the loss of garden land and being an overdevelopment that is detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The scheme would also provide an uninviting front entrance with poor legibility and connection to the existing blocks, undermining the amenities of for future occupiers. Lastly the proposed development by reason of its siting, height and layout in relation to the nearest block on site and adjoining sites

would harm conditions of light and outlook and be overbearing and lead to intrusive overlooking and loss of privacy

- 4.60 All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out below.

8. RECOMMENDATION

For the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by virtue of its design, layout, siting, and scale, would appear cramped and contrived within the constraints of the site, resulting in the loss of garden land and being an overdevelopment that is detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. The scheme would also provide an uninviting front entrance with poor legibility and connection to the existing blocks, undermining the amenities of for future occupiers. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies D5 and D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and Policies DM1, DM2, DM7 and DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017.
2. The proposed development by reason of its siting, height and layout in relation to the nearest block on site and adjoining sites would harm conditions of light and outlook and be overbearing and lead to intrusive overlooking and loss of privacy, contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policies DM1, DM7 and DM12 of The Development Management DPD 2017.

