
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: 19th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/16/3163073

82 Elm Park Avenue, Tottenham, London N15 6UY

- 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 Shulamis Lewin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref. HGY/2016/3364, dated 2 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located on the eastern side of Elm Park Avenue in a predominantly residential area. Immediately to the north of the appeal site is an electricity substation. No. 82 Elm Park Avenue is a terraced house, located at the northern end of a block of 9 properties. Within this terrace, Nos. 70 – 76 Elm Park Avenue benefit from full second floor extensions, making them 3 storeys in height, with the remaining houses, including the appeal property, having 2 storeys. It was apparent from my site visit that several properties in this terrace also benefit from rear extensions, which are mostly single storey. However, No. 72 has a substantial 2 storey flat roofed extension to the rear, which is visible in views from Gladesmore Road.
 4. The proposed development would include the erection of a part single, part 2 storey extension to the rear of the dwelling at No. 82 Elm Park Avenue, to accommodate an enlarged kitchen and bedroom in the property. The proposed extension would project around 3m to the rear of the dwelling. The ground floor would be extended across the full width of the dwelling, while the proposed extension at first floor level would be set in around 2m from the boundary with No. 80. The proposal would incorporate a flat roof.
 5. 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 Policy DM1 of the emerging Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD).

6. 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 extension 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. However, I am concerned about the impact of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the area.
7. The incorporation of a flat roof on the proposed 2 storey rear extension would not reflect the pitch roof design of the host dwelling and, given its siting, would be visible in the streetscene from the north along Elm Park Avenue. As such, it would appear as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition to the rear of this dwelling, which would be prominent and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the area.
8. Although there are examples of other flat roof rear extensions nearby, including the 2 storey rear extension at No. 72 Elm Park Avenue, within the same terrace as the appeal property, examples of poor design do not justify the development of similar extensions which would further erode the character and appearance of the area.
9. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. 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 Council's SPD and Policy DM1 of the emerging Development Management DPD.
10. I have considered all the other matters raised by the appellant including the requirement for accommodation for larger families in the area to meet the diverse needs of existing and future communities; and, the lack of any objections to the proposal from the local community; but none changes my overall conclusion that the appeal should be dismissed.

Karen L Baker

INSPECTOR