

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: 03 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3159510

24 and 26 Riverside Road, Tottenham, London N15 6DA

- 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 C Rubin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/1759, dated 17 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a three storey rear extension at 24 Riverside Road and a two storey rear extension at 26 Riverside Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a three storey rear extension at 24 Riverside Road, Tottenham, London N15 6DA and a two storey rear extension at 26 Riverside Road, Tottenham, London N15 6DA in accordance with the application Ref HGY/2016/1759, dated 17 May 2016 and 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: Ref: MR/24RiversdRd/05; MR/24RiversdRd/06; MR/24RiversdRd/07.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Matters

2. The proposal is for extensions to the rear of 24 and 26 Riverside Road following a single application from the resident of No 24. Notice of the application was served on the owner of No 26.
 3. I have amended the description of development to that given on the Council's decision notice as acknowledged on the appellant's appeal form.
-

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the street scene and the living conditions of existing residents in terms of external amenity space.

Reasons

5. Riverside Road is part of a high density residential area which borders the River Lea to the east. Several dwellings within the street have incorporated upper storey extensions including roof dormers. There are also some examples where the overall height of the dwelling has been significantly increased to incorporate an additional storey with further accommodation in the raised roof area. This type of extension is recognised in the Council's design guidance for House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document 2013 (SPD) as a 'Type 3' extension.
6. The appeal dwellings are prominently situated, mid-terrace properties fronting Riverside Road and backing onto Craven Park Road. Whilst the stretch of terrace which includes the appeal site is relatively uniform in height, it is not so in terms of appearance when viewed from Craven Park Road. From my visit it was evident that there are a variety of rear extensions along the terrace, with several properties incorporating rear roof dormers. Combined with the screening effect of tall rear boundary walls, these features tend to detract from the uniformity and prominence of the main rear elevation of the terrace. In addition the Council has confirmed that No 24 has recently received planning permission for the aforementioned 'Type 3' extension. Once implemented this will result in a dramatic change to the overall height of that dwelling, thus further disrupting the uniformity of the terrace.
7. The proposed extensions would be tall, particularly to the rear of No 24 where the extension would rise to second storey level, and somewhat functional in appearance incorporating a flat roof. However the extensions would mirror one another to first floor level and would not project significantly beyond the main rear elevation of the dwellings. They would tend to be visually absorbed by the mass of the main dwelling, with the bulk of the approved 'Type 3' extension serving to dilute any sense of an obtrusive addition to the rear of No 24, and also from a wider perspective by the presence of the imposing side elevation of apartment blocks on the opposite side of Craven Park Road. Furthermore the appearance of this form of extension would not be an alien feature within the locality, with similar extensions evident to the rear of the adjacent terrace from the riverside footway.
8. The extensions would leave sufficient amenity space within the respective rear yards to allow for sitting outside and the drying of washing. Drawing the above considerations together I do not concur with the Council that the proposal would result in over-development of the respective plots. I conclude that the proposal would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the street scene or to the living conditions of existing residents.
9. Accordingly the proposed extensions would not conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015; Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013; Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 and emerging Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document insofar as they seek to promote a high quality of

design that is sensitive and complementary to local character and ensures a high standard of amenity for users. The proposal would not strictly accord with guidance set out in the Council's SPD which advises that 'Type 3' extensions are considered to be the maximum permissible extension in South Tottenham. However the specific circumstances are considered to justify an exception to the guidance in this case.

Conditions and Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.
11. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extensions are needed to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. The Council has suggested a further condition, the effect of which would be to remove permitted development rights for alterations to the front and side elevations of the dwelling. Such a condition, however, would not be reasonable as it would not be proportionate to the development proposed in this case.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR