
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2016

by Rachel Walmsley BSc MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 15 June 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/15/3140246

63 Ferndale Road, Tottenham, London N15 6UG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jeetooa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2015/2521, dated 31 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 27 October 2015.
 - The development is described as the 'erection of front and rear dormer roof extension.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the development of a roof extension to create a second floor and first floor rear extension at 63 Ferndale Road, Tottenham, London N15 6UG, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2015/2521 dated 31 August 2015, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

2. The main issue raised by this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Procedural matters

3. I have altered the description of development to 'a roof extension to create a second floor and first floor rear extension' to more accurately describe the development proposed. It is on this basis that I have determined the appeal.
4. The adjacent site, No 61 Ferndale Road is the subject of an appeal; ref APP/Y5420/D/15/3140247. Whilst reference will be made to this proposal in my consideration of this appeal, both appeal decisions will be considered as a separate entity and are therefore separate from one another.
5. Revised drawings were submitted with the appeal. These were labelled as for information only and I have treated them on that basis.

Reasons

6. The appeal dwelling is situated within a row of terraced houses. Although there is variation in the design of the houses within the street, there is a strong rhythm of details including ground floor bay windows and porches, two storey

- windows, pitched roofs, corbels and chimneys. Together, these features give the area a pleasing and well defined character.
7. Features which exist on the appeal property include white facing bricks on the front elevation, a projecting bay window at ground floor level and brick lintels.
 8. Within the street there are notable roof extensions. This includes one at nearby No 65, although I am mindful of the Council's view that this has not been built in accordance with the approved plans. The Council's Supplementary Document *House Extensions in South Tottenham* (adopted October 2013) (SPD) was published to redress concerns regarding inappropriate roof extensions within the area.
 9. The proposed roof extension is categorised as a type 2 extension within the SPD. A type 2 extension is a whole floor extension with flat roof behind a parapet wall and is identified within the SPD as being acceptable, subject to matters of scale and design.
 10. With regards to scale, the type 2 extension would be consistent with the width of the host property and proportionate to the existing house and would reflect the scale of similar extensions within the area, including the neighbouring roof extension at No 65. I have taken account of the Council's comments regarding differences between No 65 as built and as approved, but the differences highlighted are not critical to my view regarding the acceptability of the scheme before me. Furthermore, whilst the proposal would protrude beyond the roof plane of No 61 and therefore would be noticeable within the street, the SPD supports this form of development, subject to matters of design and scale. In my judgement the roof extension would be acceptable in terms of its scale.
 11. With regards to design, the proposed windows in the roof extension would reflect the design and scale of those on the appeal property. The drawings indicate that the colour of the render would match that on No 65. I consider that a match with the colour of the front elevation of the appeal property would better guarantee that the roof extension was in-keeping with the host dwelling. A planning condition which stipulates that the colour of the render should match that on the existing dwelling would be reasonable.
 12. The SPD states that type 2 extensions should include a parapet and cornice. The proposed development includes both. Whilst the size of the cornice is not stipulated in the SPD, the current design is unsatisfactory in my view and a cornice that projected further would help create a more defining characteristic. However, the necessary changes are relatively minor and I am inclined to the appellant's view that this could be addressed with a planning condition.
 13. Corbels are not a requirement of the SPD and are not proposed on the roof extension. However, there is evidence of corbel detailing below the eaves of the existing property and I consider that similar detailing would help ensure that the development would maintain the characteristic features within the street and would be integral to the design of the host property. Again, this could be addressed with a planning condition.
 14. The proposal includes a rear extension at first floor. This form of development is strongly discouraged within the SPD because an additional floor to the main house is considered to provide 'adequate extra living space' and because of the impact such development can have on the amenity of the occupiers of

neighbouring properties with regards to overlooking and overshadowing. I appreciate that, even without this element of the scheme, the development would still provide significant additional living space. However, that is not, in itself a reason to reject it, in the absence of harm. The Council raised no objection on the grounds of overlooking and overshadowing. This limits the weight I can therefore attach to the conflict with the SPD. Furthermore, whilst the rear extension at first floor would alter the form and scale of the host dwelling, it would not detract from the overall character of the property or be visible from the street to be considered harmful to the host property or to the character of the area.

15. I recognise that both extensions proposed would alter the form and scale of the dwelling overall. For the reasons given above, however, and subject to the amendments to the detailing of the scheme outlined above, the development would not harm the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area. Consequently there is no conflict with Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013-2026, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015, which collectively seek to ensure that development makes a positive contribution to the local area, incorporating high quality design which responds to context.

Other matters

16. I have noted the Council's reference to appeal Ref APP/Y5420/D/15/3064345, in which shortcomings of detail led to the dismissal of the appeal. However, whatever the inadequacies of that proposal, I am satisfied that, on the basis of my site visit and the information before me, I have sufficient information to make an informed judgement on the development before me and that any unsatisfactory details could be addressed with planning conditions.

Conditions

17. The Council has suggested two planning conditions which I have considered against the advice in the Planning Practice Guidance and against the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. As a result I have amended them for clarity and added others as explained below.
18. In addition to the standard time limitation for commencement, I have imposed a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans as this provides certainty.
19. A condition requiring the colour of the materials to match the host property and a condition requiring the submission, approval and implementation of corbel and cornice details have been included to safeguard the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the immediate area. Also in the interests of character and appearance I have included a condition restricting changes to the front elevation of the host property. Being a terraced house and with no public views to the rear, restricting changes to the side and rear elevations is not necessary.
20. I have insufficient evidence to show that a condition relating to the structural integrity of the building is needed, given the provisions of the Building Regulations, and therefore I have not included a condition to this effect.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

R Walmsley

INSPECTOR

CONDITIONS SCHEDULE

1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans 63-YJ-PP-104 and 63-YJ-PP-103 except in respect of the details specified in conditions 3 and 4 below.
3. Notwithstanding the submitted drawings, the colour of the roof extension hereby permitted shall match the colour of the front elevation of the host property.
4. Notwithstanding the submitted drawings, details of corbels and cornicing shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of the development. The development shall not be occupied until it has been completed in the accordance with the approved details.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no modifications, other than those expressly authorised by this permission, shall be made to the front elevation or the roof of the host property.