

---

# 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/17/3171842**

**71 Russell Avenue, Wood Green, London N22 6QB**

- 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 Mrs Asma Mahbub against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
  - The application Ref HGY/2016/4074, dated 26 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2017.
  - The development proposed is the construction of a timber dormer to rear roof slope and insertion of 3 roof windows to front roof slope.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Noel Park Conservation Area (CA). In determining the appeal it is therefore necessary to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also sets out that conservation areas are designated heritage assets and that great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
4. The special interest of the CA largely derives from its planned grid pattern of residential terraces. The terraces in the vicinity of the appeal site generally have simple rear pitched roofs where dormers do not form part of the original design. The roofs have a visually pleasing rhythmic continuity which is an important part of the character of the area. In Russell Avenue the continuity is brought to a terminus by corner plot properties which have a more complex and grandiose roof form that includes a turret feature.
5. The roofscape of which the mid terrace appeal property forms part has largely been unaltered. There is a rear dormer at No 83 Russell Avenue but it is not directly comparable because it is viewed as part of the more complex roof form of its corner plot position. Examples of mid terrace rear dormers in the wider area are very much an exception. Located some distance away and forming a part of other terraces, they are not influential in the consideration of the appeal proposal.

6. The proposed rear dormer would be set back a short distance from the eaves and set down by a small degree from the ridge. It would be centrally positioned and leave a large proportion of the roof slope to the house exposed and intact. Despite its fairly modest proportions, the dormer would nevertheless be sufficiently bulky to harmfully disrupt the important rhythmic continuity of the existing roofscape. It would be visually prominent and intrusive in public views from Salisbury Road and in private views from the rear of neighbouring properties. It would appear as an incongruous addition to the original character of the house and the terrace.
7. The appellant considers the Council has been inconsistent in its decision making and draws attention to a similar proposal that was permitted in 2013 at No 59 Russell Avenue, (Council Ref: HGY/2013/1746). In response, the Council has highlighted a number of more recent decisions where proposed rear dormers have been refused permission and the associated appeals dismissed. These include proposals at Nos 10 and 81 Hewitt Avenue and No 69 Russell Avenue, which adjoins the appeal property; Appeal Refs: APP/Y5420/D/15/3121561, APP/Y5420/D/15/3154713 and APP/Y5420/D/16/3143697.
8. It is acknowledged the current proposal differs from that at No 69 in terms of its positioning, bulk and materials. It is also noted that the scale of the proposed dormer has been reduced from a previously refused scheme, (Council Ref: HGY/2015/2352). Nevertheless, a conclusion consistently reached in the decisions since 2013 is that the largely unaltered roofscapes would be significantly harmed by the insertion of dormers. In that regard the proposed scheme is no different and little weight is therefore attached to the earlier permission at No 59. In any event, that scheme does not appear to have been implemented.
9. The Council also objects to the three proposed rooflights at the front of the property. Although front rooflights exist nearby, notably at Nos 79-83 Russell Avenue, they do not exceed two in number per house. More importantly, the wide expanse of the terrace is broken up by two pairs of houses which have more pronounced gable fronts rather than feature bays. The appeal site is located between these properties, where the original character of the roof has not been changed by the insertion of rooflights. In this context, the proposal would appear excessive and harmfully disrupt an unaltered part of the roofscape.
10. The Framework specifies that where a development leads to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, as applies in this case, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The benefit of providing additional living space at a family home and the investment in the fabric and condition of the roof does not outweigh the identified harm.
11. Accordingly, it is concluded that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. It would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
12. The development would conflict with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, Policies CSV5 and UD3 of the Council's Unitary Development Plan 2006, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Council's Local Plan 2013 and Policies DM1

and DM9 of the Council's emerging Development Management DPD 2016. Amongst other things, these policies require developments to be of a nature that is sensitive to the surrounding area. They also require alterations or extensions to buildings in CAs to preserve or enhance the character of the CA.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*C J Ford*

APPOINTED PERSON