
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: 10th November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/16/3155732

69 Gladesmore Road, Tottenham, London N15 6TL

- 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 Mark Gold against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/1223, dated 15 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (a the character and appearance of 69 Gladesmore Road (No 69) and the immediate area and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, with particular regard to outlook.

Preliminary Matters

3. Reference is made in the Council's decision notice to policies in the emerging Development Management DPD. As this plan appears to be at an early stage, however, I give it little weight in my considerations and have determined the appeal in accordance with the adopted development plan.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. No 69 is one of a terrace of, typically, two storey houses on the north side of Gladesmore Road, with short rear gardens backing onto those of dwellings on Lealand Road.
5. Many, including No 69, have single storey rear extensions¹, with a more limited number of first floor extensions protruding out into the gardens. Although the terrace was, presumably, once of a strong uniform character, there is no longer, in my judgment, a particularly coherent appearance to the rear of the dwellings on Gladesmore Road in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site.

¹ No 69 also had a sizeable wooden structure attached to the ground floor rear extension, which does not appear to be shown on the plans.

This being so, there is no reason to consider that some form of extension to the appeal property would not be appropriate.

6. Nonetheless, the appeal proposal, which would result in a full width two storey extension projecting well out from the first floor building line with neighbouring dwellings, would not be sympathetic. It would be readily visible from surrounding dwellings and would appear as an incongruous 'bulge' in the building line, at odds with the dwellings to either side.
7. Reference is made by the appellant to a protruding first floor rear extension to No 63. I am not aware of that site's planning history, but it was visible from the rear of No 69 and appeared to be far from sympathetic to the host dwelling or its wider context. As such, I do not consider that it can be regarded as setting any kind of precedent for the appeal proposal.
8. My attention was also drawn to other planning permissions for first floor extensions granted by the Council in relation to other dwellings on Gladesmore Road. There are not, however, any plans before me to suggest that they are comparable to the appeal scheme rather than, say, extensions into the roof space. Nor can I be certain that they are contextually similar, with regard to the nature of the dwellings around them. As such, I give them little weight as precedents for the appeal scheme.
9. Appeal decision 3141463 was presented by the appellant. This relates, however, to a dwelling that had '*already been substantially extended*' and which is located on a different street to the appeal site. As such, I give it little weight.
10. I conclude that the appeal proposal would have an adverse impact upon the character and appearance of 69 Gladesmore Road and the immediate 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.

Living conditions

11. As noted above, the appeal proposal would, at first floor level, protrude out from the common building line with neighbouring dwellings, by well over a metre, across the full width of the rear elevation. Given the very close proximity of the neighbouring dwellings, which have sizeable windows in their rear elevations, the proposal could not, in my judgment, fail to appear prominently in the outlook from them. It would be intrusive and oppressive upon this outlook, which is already constrained to some degree by the limited back to back distances between dwellings in this area and by the sizeable trees in the rear garden of No 67.
12. In addition, the first floor projection would, in my judgment, introduce a looming presence that would be oppressive upon users of the rear gardens of the neighbouring dwellings, to their detriment.
13. I conclude that the appeal scheme would have an adverse impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings, with particular regard to outlook. It would conflict with London Plan policy 7.6 and Haringey Unitary Development Plan policy UD3. These seek, among other things, to

ensure that new development does not result in unacceptable harm to the amenity of surrounding land and buildings or cause significant adverse impacts upon residential amenity.

Other Matters

14. It is suggested that the appeal site already has consent for a large amount of development, with an additional storey, such that the appeal proposal would have negligible impacts over and above this. There are no details of this consent before me, however, such that I can come to a view on whether it is in any way comparable to the appeal scheme. As such, I give this matter little weight.

Conclusion

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

Richard Schofield

INSPECTOR