
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 March 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 05 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3166368

45 Albert Road, Wood Green, London N22 7AA

- 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 Wendy Isenwater against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/2454, dated 18 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 29 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion and rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion and rear extension at 45 Albert Road, Wood Green, London N22 7AA in accordance with the application Ref HGY/2016/2454, dated 18 July 2016 and subject to the conditions below:-
 - 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: 35/1; 35/2; 35/3; 35/4; 35/5; 35/6; 35/7; 35/8; 35/9; 35/10; 35/11; 35/12; 35/13.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the loft conversion and extension 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.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the roof extension on the character and appearance of the host building and wider street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a mid-terraced property located within a densely developed residential area. The property, in common with adjacent buildings, is characterised by a double storey rear addition which is subordinate in scale to the main dwelling. There is a pronounced stagger in the building line of the dwellings along this part of Albert Road which disrupts the uniformity of their layout. The site is located between two streets, also characterised by terraced
-

- dwellings, that run parallel to one another and which substantially screen the rear of the appeal site.
4. The proposal would consist of a substantial L-shaped dormer extension, covering the full width and height of the main roof and returning over part of the rear addition. The extension would exceed the maximum height of the rear addition and as such would not appear subordinate to it. It would not however exceed the maximum height of the main dwelling.
 5. Although the extension would be substantial in scale, there are a number mitigating factors in this case. The development would be significantly screened from public view by intervening terraces of dwellings, with only partial glimpses of the extension fleetingly available from Princes Avenue between a gap in the frontage there. It would not be visible from Albert Road at the front of the property.
 6. Whilst the extension would be visible from the rear of some nearby dwellings, the private location of these viewpoints would serve to restrict its visibility to relatively few residents. Furthermore, the extension would not cover the full length of the rear addition, roughly aligning with the existing dormer extension to the roof of the set back adjacent dwelling. This would therefore limit the visibility of its bulk, whilst helping to assimilate the development with its surroundings. In addition the development would be viewed in the context of other full width rear dormer extensions including the roofs of the neighbouring dwelling and those in the surrounding area such as along Outram Road. During my visit, it was apparent that numerous properties within the wider area have incorporated rear dormer extensions, some of which are similar in scale and design to the current proposal whilst being more prominently located.
 7. I therefore conclude, taking the above factors into account, that the proposed roof extension would not appear incongruous or dominant and would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and wider street scene. Accordingly it would conform with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2015; Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006; Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013; emerging Policy DM1 of the Council's Development Management Development Plan Document and the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they seek to secure the highest standard of design which has regard to the context and character of its surroundings.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.
9. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development are needed to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Roy Merrett

INSPECTOR