
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 February 2017

by G Rollings BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 02 March 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3160349

484 High Road, Tottenham, London, N17 9JF

- 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 Rajan Badiani (Transfleet Properties) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/1259, dated 12 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension and internal alterations to form 1 no additional 1 bedroom flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Bruce Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site accommodates two adjoining, three-storey, mid-terrace properties which front onto a shopping parade, with commercial units at ground floor level and residential accommodation amalgamated across the first and second floors. The development scheme proposes an increase in the overall roof height of the buildings, to create an additional floor of accommodation within the extended roof space. The existing first- and second-floor internal space would be reconfigured in a new residential layout.
 4. The site is within the Bruce Grove Conservation Area, and the terrace is a non-designated heritage asset on the Council's 'local list' of locally significant historic buildings. The terrace comprises a group of five visually similar buildings with a homogenous front facade at first and second floor levels. At the rear of the terrace, small yards are attached to the commercial properties at ground floor level, beyond which is a public car park.
 5. The new roof extension and upper floor would be set back from the existing front parapet wall at roof level, meaning that its visibility from high street would be limited. I agree with the appellant's assessment that the extension would not be visible on the high street in the vicinity of the site. However, the plans indicate the loss of the existing chimneys behind the parapet. These appear to be features dating from a similar time as the terrace itself and assist in defining the heritage character of the building. These are clearly visible from
-

both the street from the rear of the terrace, and their loss would be detrimental to this character.

6. At the rear of the building, the appeal buildings are capped by a terraced 'butterfly' roofline that is clearly visible across the car park and from properties with views of the rear of the site. These views do not have the prominence of the high street aspect; nonetheless, the roof form is a feature of buildings from this period, and is clearly visible across the open land of the car park, both from the public realm bordering the car park, and from the surrounding properties. Its loss would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the building or its heritage significance.
7. In creating a new floor of accommodation, the appeal site would have a roofline that would be significantly higher and of a completely different form to the remaining butterfly silhouettes of the other buildings in the terrace. I acknowledge the appellant's comments regarding the design of the rear elevation and the perceived unattractiveness of its current appearance. However, the extension would appear bulky, out of scale, and incongruous in relation to the rest of the terrace in the surrounding buildings, and as such, would appear as a discordant and obtrusive addition to the Conservation Area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful impact on the Conservation Area, as a designated heritage asset, and the building itself, as a non-designated heritage asset, and would fail to preserve or enhance its character or appearance. The harm caused to the conservation area's wider significance as a heritage asset would be less than substantial as defined in paragraph 134 of the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework). I have considered whether there would be any public benefits arising from the development, such as the contribution of a new unit of residential accommodation to the local housing supply, but in this instance, these benefits do not outweigh the harm.
9. The development would conflict with Policy SP12 which is adopted within *Haringey's Local Plan - Strategic Policies 2013-2026*, as well as Policy CSV5 of the *Haringey Unitary Development Plan* (2006) and Policy 7.8 of *The London Plan* (2015). Together, these policies require development to conserve the historic significance of the borough's heritage assets and their setting. The Council also submitted policies from its *Development Management Development Plan Document* for my consideration; however, as this document has not yet been subject to a formal examination process I can only give limited weight to its policies. Nonetheless, the proposal conflicts with the existing adopted development plan for the area, and as such, it does not represent sustainable development as defined by the Framework.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G Rollings

INSPECTOR