

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2016

**by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 30 December 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3157632**

**Flat A, 86 Greenham Road, Hornsey, London N10 1LP**

- 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 Jonathan Aitken against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
  - The application Ref HGY/2016/1497, dated 3 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 July 2016.
  - The development proposed is the formation of rear dormer extension, including over outrigger, roof deck and insertion of velux windows to front.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of rear dormer extension, including over outrigger, roof deck and insertion of velux windows to front at Flat A, 86 Greenham Road, Hornsey, London N10 1LP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2016/1497, dated 3 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: AP(00)05 Rev A, AP(00)06 Rev A and AP(00)07 Rev A.

### Procedural Matter

2. I have taken the description of development as it appears on the appeal form as, whilst differing slightly from that shown on the planning application form, it most accurately describes the development to which this appeal relates. It is clear that both parties are content with this approach since the same description appears on the Council's decision notice. I have determined the appeal on this basis.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building and the area.
-

## Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end terrace building. From the front, the two storey buildings within the terrace have an even rhythm of two storey feature bay windows and symmetrical fenestration detailing. In the main, buildings are in red brick with contrasting painted header detailing and a slate roof. To the rear, each symmetrical pair within the terrace shares a mirror image two storey outrigger extension. The building has been sub divided into two flats, one on the ground floor and one on the first.
5. The proposed development seeks to extend the first floor flat into the roof space of the main building and the outrigger in the form of an L shaped flat roof dormer and a roof terrace. Being to the rear elevation, the proposed development would be well screened from public views and thus have a limited effect on the street scene. There is a narrow gap between the appeal site and No 88 which would afford some views of the dormer in the main roof but this would be limited to a passing glimpse and in any event I note the Council had no objections to this section of the dormer.
6. As a square and arguably bulky addition to the entirety of the roof, I do accept that by definition it would not be subservient. However, in coming to a view on the merits of the proposed development, I note not only the L shaped dormer which also covers the outrigger of No 82, but the large flat roof dormer that spans a pair of semi-detached dwellings at Nos 90 and 92.
7. The proposed development would have a noticeable visual effect when viewed from the wide and expansive allotment gardens to the south east of the appeal site. Nevertheless, it would not be as extensive as the dormer to the rear of No 82, stopping short of its overall coverage of the outrigger to allow for the more visually permeable roof terrace. In addition, it would be viewed in the wider context of other large and box shaped dormer windows which are a common feature of the rear elevations of other buildings in the wider area. Not only those mentioned above but also those on the rear of semi-detached dwellings that face Coppetts Road to the south west of the appeal site.
8. It is in this somewhat evolved context that the proposed development would be read and as such, given the above reasons, it would not be an alien feature which would detract from the character and appearance of the building or the wider terrace. Whilst I have acknowledged the extent of the visual effect of the proposed development, I am further of the view that by its very nature, scale and location it would not lead to or exacerbate any sense of additional enclosure to the wider terrace.
9. For these reasons therefore, the proposed development would not conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan<sup>1</sup>, Saved Policy UD3 of the UDP<sup>2</sup>, Policy SP11 of the Local Plan<sup>3</sup> and draft Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD<sup>4</sup>. These Policies, amongst other things and along with section 7 of the Framework<sup>5</sup>, seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance, is respectful of and complements local character.

---

<sup>1</sup> The London Plan 2015

<sup>2</sup> Haringey's Unitary Development Plan 2006

<sup>3</sup> Haringey's Local Plan 2013

<sup>4</sup> Haringey's Local Plan Development Management Development Plan Document Pre Submission Version 2016

<sup>5</sup> The National Planning Policy Framework 2012

**Conditions**

10. For clarity and enforceability, I have made some consequential changes to the wording of the conditions as suggested by the Council. As well as the standard time condition, and for certainty, I have specified the approved plans.

**Conclusion**

11. For the reasons and subject to the conditions specified above, the appeal is allowed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR