

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 January 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3159752

11 Chalgrove Road, Tottenham, London N17 0NP

- 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 Kerry Keogh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/1799, dated 13 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is part single storey and part two storey rear and side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the main dwelling and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end terrace property situated at the junction of Chalgrove Road and Foyle Road. Both streets are characterised by traditional terraced properties that are relatively uniform in scale and appearance.
 4. The dwelling has a two storey rear addition which is lower in height compared to the main dwelling and which is set in from its side elevation. Accordingly the rear addition appears proportionate and subordinate to the scale of the main dwelling in what is a very prominent location in the street scene when viewed from Foyle Road.
 5. A similar form of development can be seen at other sites in the immediate locality, notably the buildings at 147 and 149 Lansdowne Road which are situated on opposite sides of the entrance to Chalgrove Road. In addition the dwelling at No 17 Chalgrove Road, on the opposite side of Foyle Road to the appeal site, though different in design, is set in from the side of the highway.
 6. These characteristics are positive design features which help to reduce the dominance of built development in close proximity to the highway and in the case of the appeal site, mark a transition to the set back forward building line of the terrace along Foyle Road.
-

7. The proposed double storey extension would completely infill the large gap between the side elevation of the existing rear addition and the boundary of the property with the highway. It would also incorporate a flat roof that would be at odds with the design of the sloping roof over the existing rear addition and would be finished in render in contrast to the London Stock brick of the main dwelling. The extension would therefore amount to a bulky and dominant development in what is a very prominent location within the street scene and would appear incongruous and contrived in relation to the sloping roof of the existing rear addition. Whilst there are examples of alternative external materials elsewhere along the terrace, the use of render would nevertheless appear discordant in relation to the brick finish of the original building.
8. I have taken into consideration the various examples of double storey extensions that have been constructed elsewhere in the surrounding area, including where there is a mis-match in materials, and which have been referred to by the appellant in support of his case. A majority of these cases however are not within the immediate locality or, in the case of the adjacent dwellings at 5, 7 and 9 Chalgrove Road, are not in such a prominent end of terrace location. These examples do not therefore undermine the character or justify the harm which I have identified above.
9. Furthermore, whilst the proposal would increase the amount and potentially the quality of internal space, I have not been presented with any compelling evidence that the extensions in the form proposed would be necessary in order to preserve the property as family accommodation.
10. I conclude that the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the main dwelling and wider street scene. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015; Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, emerging Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 1a – Design Guidance 2006 insofar as they seek to achieve high quality design that complements the local architectural character.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having taken into account all other points raised, the appeal should be dismissed.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR