

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2016

by Karen L Baker DipTP MA DipMP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 09 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/16/3162566

119-121 Craven Park Road, Tottenham, London N15 6BP

- 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 Mrs Braun against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref. HGY/2016/2584, dated 29 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor rear extensions to both properties.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. Planning permission has been granted for the erection of a 'Type 3' roof extension at No. 119 Craven Park Road (Ref. HGY/2015/1795) and for the extension of this property to the rear at ground floor level by around 3m over the full width of the dwelling and at first floor level by around 2m, which would be set back from the boundary with No. 121 by around 3.2m (Ref. HGY/2015/3449). At the time of my site visit, however, neither extension had been built.
3. The description of development is as set out above and the appellant states that the proposal would include the extension of Nos. 119 and 121 Craven Park Road at first floor level above the approved and existing ground floor extensions respectively. However, given that the ground floor extension at No. 119 was approved as part of a proposal for ground and first floor extensions and has yet to be built, I consider that the proposal at No. 119 would be better described as the erection of a 2 storey rear extension. I have, therefore, considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the existing dwellings.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on the northern side of Craven Park Road, in a predominantly residential area. The dwellings at Nos. 119 and 121 Craven Park Road are 2 storey properties sited at the western end of a terrace of 5
-

- houses. No. 121 benefits from an existing ground floor extension to the rear, across the full width of the dwelling.
6. Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026, adopted in March 2013, says that all development shall be of the highest standard of design that respects its local context and character and historic significance, to contribute to the creation and enhancement of Haringey's sense of place and identity. Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (UDP), adopted in July 2006, says that development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the proposal complements the character of the local area and is of a nature and scale that is sensitive to the surrounding area. This is reflected in Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan (2016) and in Policies DM1 and DM12 of the emerging Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD).
 7. Paragraph 3.42 of the Council's House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), First Revision, adopted in October 2013, says that rear extensions must be of the highest quality design, constructed in a sympathetic architectural style with detailing, fenestration and materials to match the existing style. Paragraph 3.47 generally discourages 2 storey extensions where planning permission is required, particularly for the preservation of daylight, sunlight and from overlooking to neighbours. The Council raises no concerns with respect to the impact of the proposed extensions on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and I am satisfied, from the evidence before me, that the proposal would not be harmful in this respect.
 8. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG): Urban Design, SPG 1a Design Guidance, adopted in 2006, says, in paragraph F.2., that extensions to buildings should be subordinate in scale to the original building and should respect its architectural character. Furthermore, it states that full width rear extensions are not normally considered acceptable and they should not extend more than two thirds the width of the rear of the house and should remain at least one storey below eaves level.
 9. A 'Type 3' roof extension is defined in the SPD as a full second floor extension with loft accommodation at third floor level possible within the pitched roof. The SPD also states that this is considered to be the maximum permissible extension in South Tottenham. I acknowledge the appellant's statement that the 'Type 3' extension has not been implemented and therefore should not have been a material consideration in the Council's determination of the planning application the subject of this appeal. However, this is an extant planning permission and, as such, could be implemented at any time and therefore remains a material consideration in this appeal. Nevertheless, I note that the Council allowed the part single storey and part 2 storey rear extension to No. 119 Craven Park Road, following its approval of the 'Type 3' roof extension.
 10. It is apparent from the evidence before me, therefore, that the Council considers that the ground floor extension of No. 119 Craven Park Road would be acceptable in principle, following the grant of planning permission for a 'Type 3' roof extension, and that an extension at first floor level of this property would be appropriate, subject to its scale and size being subordinate to the host property.

11. The proposed development would include the extension of No. 119 Craven Park Road to the rear by around 3m at ground floor level, across the full width of the property, and the extension of both Nos. 119 and 121 to the rear at first floor level by around 2m, across the full width of No. 119 and across more than half the width of No. 121, before stepping in to around 0.69m for the remainder adjacent to the boundary with No. 123. The proposal would incorporate a flat roof on both the ground floor and first floor elements of the proposed extensions and would require the removal of the original eaves to the rear of both host properties.
12. In my opinion, given its scale, height and design, along with its projection at first floor level, the proposal would not reflect the design characteristics or detailing of the host dwellings and would not appear subordinate to them. As such, the proposed extensions would appear as an incongruous and visually obtrusive addition to the rear of this terrace.
13. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the existing dwellings. As such, it would be contrary to Local Plan Policy SP11, Policy UD3 of the UDP and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan and would not accord with the SPG and SPD or Policies DM1 and DM12 of the emerging Development Management DPD.
14. I have considered all the other matters raised by the appellant including that the proposal would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents; a recently allowed appeal at 67 Wellington Avenue (Ref. APP/Y5420/D/15/3141463); and, the support for the proposal from local residents; but none changes my overall conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

Karen L Baker

INSPECTOR