

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2016

**by Richard Schofield BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10<sup>th</sup> November 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/16/3158572**

**109 Chesterfield Gardens, Tottenham, London N4 1LW**

- 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 Theodoros Zararis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
  - The application Ref HGY/2016/2516, dated 30 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2016.
  - The development proposed is described as 'retention of rear dormer'.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary matters

2. It was apparent from my site visit that development has already taken place. It appeared to accord with the plans before me and I have determined the appeal on this basis.
3. It was drawn to my attention by the appellant at the site visit that his surname is 'Zararis' rather than 'Zarakis' (as it appears on the documentation). I have amended the header above accordingly.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

### Reasons

5. 109 Chesterfield Gardens is situated within an attractive terrace of two storey dwellings, which, although displaying variations in external finish, are of a strongly uniform design and character with very few fundamental alterations. The rear elevations of the dwellings display a similarly coherent design, with no obvious second floor extensions.
  6. The appeal scheme, which is readily apparent from the rear of surrounding properties, contrasts strongly with this robust design rhythm. Its boxy appearance is fundamentally at odds with the historic pattern of two storey gable end rear elevations. It sits very uncomfortably with the form and design of the host dwelling, giving No 109 a lopsided appearance in relation to its neighbours and serving to unbalance the existing sense of symmetry with No
-

107. The use of bright, terracotta hanging tiles, which have no reference point in the local vernacular, serves to draw further attention to its alien appearance.
7. I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the area. It would conflict with London Plan policies 7.4 and 7.6, Haringey Unitary Development Plan policy UD3 and Haringey Local Plan policy SP11, which seek, among other things, to ensure that new development is of the highest architectural quality, respects its local context and complements the character of the local area.

### **Other Matters**

8. The appellant suggests that the extension has no adverse impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. This may be so, but this is not a matter in dispute.

### **Conclusion**

9. For the reasons given above, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard Schofield*

INSPECTOR