

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2016

by Andrew McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 5th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3153260
63C Upper Tollington Park, London N4 4DD

- 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 Michalakos Louca against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/0926, dated 21 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion to create two new bedrooms and a bathroom, rear dormer erected, 3 x roof lights inserted into front elevation and current hipped roof to flank elevation will be changed to a gable wall. There will be no change in current residential use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Stroud Green Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a three-storey end of terrace property which comprises three self-contained flats. The proposed development relates to the top floor flat which is situated within the Stroud Green Conservation Area (CA). The area is predominantly residential and is characterised by a number of three storey Victorian terraces which are grouped together along Upper Tollington Park. Whilst each group of properties differ in style, detail and appearance, including hipped and gable rooflines, the properties within each group have a consistent appearance. The appeal property, although positioned midway between Victoria Road and Florence Road, forms the end property of one such group comprising 63 to 79 Upper Tollington Park (nos 63 to 79). As such, there is a gap in the built form between 61 Upper Tollington Park (No 61) and the appeal property, resulting in its side wall and hipped roof being visible from the street.
 4. The properties at nos 63 to 79 have a uniform and cohesive appearance in the streetscene. The property at the opposite end of this group (No 79) has a hipped roof which is prominent and visible in the area due to its position at the junction of Upper Tollington Park and Florence Road.
 5. It is argued that the proposed changes to the appeal property would be modest, that similar features are common place in the street and the use of
-

- matching materials and colours would ensure that the character and appearance of the building and CA would be preserved. Furthermore, it is stated that the proposed roofline would match other gable end properties nearby, create a greater degree of consistency in the streetscene and therefore would not be harmful to the character of the area.
6. Notwithstanding the above, the proposed alteration to the roof and side wall would unbalance the roofline of the group of properties at nos 63 to 79 and result in the loss of the decorative overhanging eaves and bracket detail. In addition, the proposed gable roof would create an awkward juxtaposition with the sloping gabled roof of No 61 which would be at a right angle to the proposed roof. This would have a detrimental effect on the visual relationship between the properties at nos 61 and 63 and on the two groups of properties in terms of the wider character and appearance of the streetscene. Furthermore, the gap between nos 61 and 63 and the visibility of the side elevation of the appeal property would only exacerbate the adverse impact on the character of the area and the appearance of the properties.
 7. The proposed roof would be at odds with the hipped roof at the opposite end of the group of properties at no 79 and would result in an imbalance in its overall appearance. Furthermore, it would introduce an inconsistent design element into the built form of the group of properties and the wider area where distinct groups of properties cumulatively contribute to the character and appearance of the streetscene along Upper Tollington Park. Whilst there are several other examples of hipped to gable roofs nearby, I must assess this proposal on its own merits, context and circumstances. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would have a detrimental effect on the appeal property, the group of properties to which it belongs, the wider streetscene and the CA.
 8. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Therefore, I have a duty to consider whether the proposal would result in any harm being caused to the designated heritage asset. In doing so, I must apply considerable weight to the preservation or enhancement of the CA. Given my findings above, I consider that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. I consider that the harm to the CA would be 'less than substantial' in terms of Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Therefore, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
 9. I appreciate the appellant's intention to provide suitable accommodation for his family within the existing family home and the use of design and matching materials to minimise any adverse effect on the locality. As a result, cumulatively, I give these matters moderate weight. However, these are balanced against the considerable weight I must give to the harm that would be caused to the CA as a designated heritage asset. Accordingly, I find that the cumulative benefits of the proposal would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
 10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would be an incongruent and discordant addition to the host property and the streetscene. As a result, it would have a harmful effect on the building and its surroundings and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

11. Consequently, the proposed development would be contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2015, saved Policies CSV5 and UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2013, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, draft Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (Pre-Submission Version) 2016 and the Framework. Amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure that development respects its surrounding area and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McCormack

INSPECTOR