



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 May 2017

by R A Exton Dip URP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/17/3169572
9 Wilmot Road, London N17 6LH

- 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 A Joannou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/2202, dated 22 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is demolition of side garage and extension of existing three bedroom dwelling to form new two bed house with two dormer windows to the side elevation and one dormer window to the rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed. Planning permission is granted for demolition of side garage and extension of existing three bedroom dwelling to form new two bed house with two dormer windows to the side elevation and one dormer window to the rear elevation at 9 Wilmot Road, London N17 6LH, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2016/2202 dated 22 March 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: Nos WIL P2 01,02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12 and 13, all issued March 2016.
 - 3) The external materials to be used on the development hereby permitted shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing dwelling.
 - 4) The development hereby permitted shall be designed to Part M4 (2) 'accessible and adaptable dwellings' of the Building Regulations 2015 (formerly Lifetime Homes Standard) unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
-

Reasons

3. Wilmot Road is formed by dwellings of similar design sited within terraced rows of varying length along well defined building lines. Breaks in the terracing occur infrequently on the bends in the road where the dwellings form shorter rows or, as in the case of the appeal site, are semi-detached.
4. Although I consider that the linear nature of development and its siting parallel to the road is the defining characteristic of area, the breaks in terracing and views through them do contribute to its character to a lesser extent.
5. The design of the proposal would follow the linear nature of existing development and its siting relative to the road. The visual effect of the proposal on the street scene would be limited by its set back position and lower ridge height relative to the host dwelling. The proposal would partly infill the break between No 9 and No 11 Wilmot Road but there would remain a view through the break, over the single storey garage at No 11, thereby not creating a terracing effect. In contrast to neighbouring dwellings, the corner position of No 9 means that its plot widens significantly away from the road. The combination of these factors leads me to conclude that the proposal would relate positively to its locality and consequently respect the open and suburban character of development in the surrounding area. It would therefore comply with the elements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 and Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan. These policies include provisions to ensure that new development is of a high quality and respects its surroundings and are consistent with the content of the National Planning Policy Framework. I have had limited regard to draft policy DM1 due to its emerging status.
6. I note the Council's concern over the precedent for terracing that this proposal may create but can afford this little weight. Having found that the proposal itself does not create a terracing effect and complies with the development plan, whether or not the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling, or any others in the vicinity, wish to pursue similar proposals is not a matter before me. I have assessed this proposal on its own merits in light of the development plan and material considerations and the Council have the ability to do the same for any future proposals.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted. I have considered the conditions suggested by the council. It is necessary that materials match the existing dwelling in order to provide a satisfactory appearance. The Local Plan seeks to ensure that new developments are accessible for wheelchair users and a condition to this effect is required. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.

Richard Exton

INSPECTOR

