
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 April 2017

by Brendan Lyons BArch MA MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 08 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/17/3171227

58 Twyford Avenue, Hornsey, London N2 9NL

- 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 Max Mastro against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2017/0061, dated 23 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as a loft conversion.
-

Preliminary matter

1. The above description of development, which is taken from the planning application form, was amended in the Council's decision notice. This altered description was then used by the appellant for the purposes of the appeal. As it represents a fuller and more accurate description of the proposed development, I shall also adopt it for the appeal decision.

Decision

2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a rear dormer extension, with associated works to alter the hipped roof to form a gable end, at 58 Twyford Avenue, Hornsey, London N2 9NL, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref HGY/2017/0061 dated 23 December 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: DPL. 99, DPL.05, DPL.06, DPL.07, DPL.08, DPL.09, DPL.10, DPL.11, DPL.12, DPL.13, DPL.14.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The second floor windows in the west gable of the roof extension hereby permitted shall be at all times fitted with obscure glazing and shall have no opening sections lower than 1.7m above second floor level.
-

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the house and of the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a substantial semi-detached house that forms one of many similar detached and semi-detached houses that line both sides of a suburban residential road. The house and its neighbour, No.60, form a symmetrical pair when seen from the road, with a main hipped roof set behind matching prominent gable features, and a slightly lower hipped roof projecting to each side.
5. It is now proposed to convert the loft to provide two additional bedrooms. Permission is sought for a flat-roofed dormer window across the full width of the rear roof slope. The side hipped roof would be converted to a gable, with two narrow windows at second floor level.
6. The house has been altered and extended in the past. The recess to the front above the garage has been infilled by a first-floor extension, to match No.60. More recently, the house has been extended to the rear with a flat-roofed single storey addition across the full width of the house.
7. The rear of the house is not open to public viewpoints. The proposed dormer would represent a radical alteration of the rear roof, but seen in the context of the strongly horizontal form of the ground floor extension, it would not look unduly incongruous. Moreover, it would relate closely to a similar dormer at the adjoining house, No.56, and would be seen as part of a consistent pattern of other such roof additions in the row of houses to the east, so that the lack of a balancing extension at No.60 would not be critical in this instance.
8. From the road, the existing house presents quite a complex roof form, with the front gable providing a dominant feature. The minor side roof is well recessed and is not prominent. The proposed enlargement of the side roof would raise the ridge but would not make the roof form appear greatly more prominent. The extra volume of roof would not look unduly large, and it would retain a reduced span at the new gable, defined by the proposed area of vertical tiling set back from the front behind the existing extension. The departure from the symmetry of the pair of houses would not be discordant.
9. The enlargement would again closely respond to the similar feature at No.56, so that the gabled form would not appear incongruous. Although the feeling of space between buildings would be partly reduced, as views of the sky and trees between the houses would be slightly curtailed, the overall spacious character of the row of houses and of the street scene would not be harmed.
10. The appellant has provided detailed evidence of the many roof enlargements that have been carried out on Twyford Avenue and the adjoining roads, which I was able to see on my visit to the site. I consider it fair to say that such alterations are now quite characteristic of the area. This context would help to absorb the proposed change without difficulty.
11. In summary, I consider that the proposal would not harm the character and appearance of the house and of the surrounding area. There would be no conflict with the design objectives of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan

2016, or of saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013, and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the emerging Haringey Development Management DPD.

Conditions

12. In addition to standard conditions on commencement time and compliance with approved plans, the Council has put forward a condition requiring materials to match the existing house. The appellant raises no objection and I consider the three conditions to be reasonable and necessary.
13. The Council accepts that there would be no harm to the living conditions of residents of No.56 due to loss of light or outlook. However, I consider that a further condition is necessary to confirm that the proposed new gable windows would not result in any adverse impact on privacy.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having taken all submissions into account, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to those conditions.

Brendan Lyons

INSPECTOR