

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 February 2017

by Gareth W Thomas BSc(Hons) MSc(Dist) PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 24th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3162919

Flat A, 13 Sylvan Avenue, Wood Green, London N22 5HX

- 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 Ms Sonia Maynadier against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/2320, dated 1 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is for a rear and side roof extensions and insertion of 4x velux windows all to facilitate a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear and side roof extensions and insertion of 4x velux windows all to facilitate a loft conversion at Flat A, 13 Sylvan Avenue, Wood Green, London N22 5HX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2016/2320, dated 1 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 170/001; 170/002; 170/003; 170/004 and Site Location Plan dated 26 October 2016.
 - 3) The side dormer extension facing No.20 Sylvan Avenue hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the window has been fitted with obscured glazing, and no part of that window shall be capable of being opened. Once installed the obscured glazing shall be retained thereafter.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a large semi-detached Edwardian villa with a double storey full height projecting bay window to the front. The property lies within a mature suburban street containing similar houses, which has a sylvan character gained from the presence of street trees.
4. The proposal would see the construction of two dormers, one to the side elevation, which projects to its side to form a substantial two storey extension

and the other to the rear, together with the insertion of roof lights to both front and rear hipped roof slopes. The proposal would incorporate a staircase leading to two bedrooms in the loft space and a separate shower room. The property is subdivided horizontally to form two self-contained flats.

5. In relation to the rear dormer, it is noted that the adjoining property has a similar flat roofed dormer and whilst the proposed dormer is marginally larger and occupies a significant portion of the rear roof slope, it does not protrude above the ridge. I noted during my site visit that there are numerous examples of flat roofed dormers of this type in the wider area. Whilst the rear of the two semi-detached properties are visible from Glendale Avenue, the presence of a similar dormer at the neighbouring property No24 and the other vertical elements within the roofscape such as chimneys and chimney stacks, together with the bulky two storey rear extension also at No24, represent significantly dominant architectural features. Consequently, views of the rear from Glendale Avenue are already compromised to a significant degree. This aspect of the proposal within this context would not be unduly prominent.
6. Turning to the proposed dormer to the side of the property, this would incorporate a hipped roof to the same angle as the main roof. It would also be set back from the front projection to the main house and be acceptable in scale, mass and design. Any prominence would also be negated by the fact that the properties here are fairly tightly packed. This element would only be visible from the public domain when close up to the pavement edge in front of the property. Consequently, I also find this element to be acceptable.
7. The Council do not raise concerns about the proposed roof lights; I agree that these are of little consequence and are acceptable.
8. Accordingly, the proposed development would comply with policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and with Policy DM1 of the Draft Development Management DPD, which, in combination, seek to ensure that developments enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment through respecting local context, character and historical significance whilst also respecting local distinctiveness. These policies are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of ensuring high quality design in new developments.

Conditions

9. In addition to the standard condition in relation to commencement of development, a condition specifying approved plans is necessary in the interests of providing certainty. Whilst the Council did not articulate its possible concerns about overlooking in the form of a suggested condition, I consider that it is necessary in the interests of securing adequate privacy levels for windows in the side dormer to be finished in obscure glazing.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should succeed.

Gareth W Thomas

INSPECTOR