
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by Michael Boniface MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3153693

37 Sirdar Road, Wood Green, London, N22 6QS

- 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 Martin Selwyn against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2015/1822, dated 11 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 3 December 2015.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing detached garage to the side of 37 Sirdar Road, sub-division of the plot and the erection of an attached, two storey, one-bed dwelling, with accommodation arranged over 3 floors.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The design of the proposed development was amended during the course of the planning application through the submission of amended plans and the Council made its decision on the basis of these amended drawings. I have considered the appeal on the same basis.
3. The Council confirms that it no longer relies on its second reason for refusal dealing with affordable housing in light of recent changes to Planning Practice Guidance and the Written Ministerial Statement (November 2014) on this issue, both of which have effect following a recent Court of Appeal Judgement¹. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the corner of Sirdar Road and Hawke Park Road, comprising a narrow strip of land accommodating a single storey garage attached to an established residential terrace. The area is characterised by terraced buildings which, in Sirdar Road, are purpose built flats. The buildings are uniform in their design and form and there is a clearly defined pattern of development. The areas of land at the end of terraces are characteristic of the

¹ Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government v West Berkshire District Council and Reading Borough Council C1/2015/2559; [2016] EWCA Civ 441.

- area, as is the presence of single storey garages, offering some visual relief before meeting the bisecting streets.
6. The proposed development seeks to introduce a two storey building that would fill the width of the plot, diminishing the visual relief and sense of spaciousness currently provided by the space above the small scale garage on the site. In addition, the width of the buildings frontage would be significantly less than that of the attached building and others within the terrace. Even considering the different elements of the neighbouring buildings, involving a prominent gabled section and a recessed entrance portion, the development would still appear as an anomaly, disrupting the rhythm and uniformity of the street scene.
 7. I note that there is some evidence of buildings having been altered and extended, including on the end of terraces and I acknowledge the two storey development up to the pavement edge at 28 Westbury Avenue. However, Westbury Avenue is quite different in character to Sirdar Road and I did not see any example that was directly comparable to the appeal proposal. In any case, these do not alter the predominant character that I have identified and I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
 8. The development would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be in conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015) which seek high quality design that is appropriate to its context, including the pattern and grain of existing streets; Policies SP2 and SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan, Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026 (2013) which have similar design objectives; and Policy UD3 of the Unitary Development Plan (2006) which seeks to protect the character of the area.
 9. I have had regard to the Framework's objective to boost significantly the supply of housing and the great need for housing across London. The principle of residential development in this area is not disputed by the Council but the proposal does not constitute sustainable development given the significant conflict with the important design objectives that I have identified.
 10. In light of the above, and having considered all other matters, the appeal is dismissed.

Michael Boniface

INSPECTOR