
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by C J Ford BA (Hons) BTP Dist. MRTPI

a person appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 08 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/17/3171182

29A Eastern Road, Wood Green, London N22 7DD

- 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 D Vaswani against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/3868, dated 8 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 3 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is first floor extension above the single storey extension to the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area and on the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjoining property with particular regard to daylight/sunlight, outlook and visual impact.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The surrounding area comprises streets of two storey terraces with a well-used footpath running along one end of the streets. The Eastern Road terraces have distinctive two storey gable ended outriggers with simple pitched roofs. An important part of the character of the area is the relationship between the final house in each terrace and the footpath. Generally, the only two storey element that directly adjoins the footpath is the main part of the house. The rear projections are either single storey or set back from the footpath where they are higher. This relationship gives the footpath a greater sense of openness and this spaciousness makes it a pleasant place to walk.
4. The appeal property is an addition to the original layout of the street. It is an end of terrace house and does not have the conventional two storey outrigger. It has a single storey rear projection instead that runs directly alongside the footpath, as does the main part of the house. The projection has a flat roof with a low parapet wall running along the flank and far end.

5. The extension would add a second storey to the rear projection. The tiled pitched parapet would have the external appearance of a crown roof sitting just below the eaves to the main part of the house. The extension would be visible in private views from neighbouring properties and in public views from the footpath. It would be seen in the context of the distinctive simple outriggers found in the remainder of the terrace. Within this context, the complex shape of the roof and the resulting overall form of the rear projection would appear as an alien and incongruous addition to the house and the wider terrace.
6. I acknowledge the existing single storey projection does not presently reflect the form and character of the outriggers within the terrace. However, owing to its higher level positioning, the extension would be more prominent and have a greater visual impact.
7. The development would also extend the two storey element that runs directly alongside the footpath. This would be at odds with the existing pattern of development in the area and reduce the sense of openness currently experienced when using the footpath. It would become a more intimidating place to walk as a result. The re-use of the existing feature circular window and its insertion at first floor level would fail to overcome this harm.
8. I note the development represents a modified scheme from one previously refused by the Council. However, it is evident from the findings above that the changes made are insufficient to make the revised scheme acceptable. Furthermore, the benefit of providing additional living space at the property does not outweigh the identified harm.
9. Accordingly, it is concluded that the extension would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. The development would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 as well as Policy UD3 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP), Policy SP11 of the Council's Local Plan 2013 (LP) and Policy DM1 of the Council's emerging Development Management DPD 2016 (DPD). Amongst other things, these policies require development proposals to complement the character of the local area and be of a nature and scale that is sensitive to the surrounding area.

Living conditions

10. The neighbouring property, No 29, has been horizontally divided into two flats. There is no dispute that the two windows in the rear elevation of the main part of the building serve a kitchen to each flat. Two windows on the flank of the outrigger, facing the appeal site, serve the living room of the ground floor flat.
11. The proposed extension would project beyond a forty-five degree angle in relation to the two windows in the rear elevation. Its high level bulk would result in reduced daylight/sunlight, a poorer outlook and a greater sense of enclosure to occupiers of No 29.
12. Nevertheless, there would be some mitigation derived from the set back of the extension from the boundary and the fact the ground floor flat also has an outlook and takes in light from the far end of the outrigger. Consequently, whilst there would be some deterioration in the living conditions of the occupiers of No 29, the extension would not result in significant harm, or be at odds with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan or Policy UD3 of the UDP,

Policy SP11 of the LP or Policy DM1 of the emerging DPD. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure there is no significant adverse impact on residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight or aspect.

Conclusion

13. Notwithstanding the finding on living conditions, the harm in respect of the character and appearance of the area is an overriding consideration. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

C J Ford

APPOINTED PERSON