
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 May 2017

by Janet Wilson BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI DMS

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

Decision date: 13th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/17/3170395

1 Florentia House, Vale Road, Haringey, LONDON N4 1TD

- 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 Nick Yianni of Mark Anthony Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/3850, dated 3 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 17 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is second floor extension to form additional living space.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The building, a former commercial unit is located on a prominent corner site. It lies in a mixed use area with commercial uses at ground floor level along Vale Road and a retail village of small units to the rear. The upper floors of the building and the adjacent building have been converted to residential use, however they maintain much of their original appearance and feel retaining their industrial character which is of some architectural merit.
 4. The proposal introduces a complete additional storey which would be simple and modern in its detail incorporating a glazed curtain wall to the street frontage. Amendments made during the application process incorporated walls of zinc to the side and rear and set back the extension behind the parapet. The side elevation would sit close to but not attached to the pitched roof of the adjacent building. Even though the flat roof would be lower than the ridge of the adjacent building it would project forward of that roof pitch resulting in a distinctly boxy appearance which would be visually discordant, excessively prominent and would jar with the existing structure. It would relate poorly to the host building and would be overly dominant detracting from the appearance of the area.
 5. Taken together these factors would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area in conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan - The Spatial Development Strategy for London
-

Consolidated with Alterations since 2011 (2016) and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2013). It would also be contrary to provisions in the Haringey Supplementary Planning Guidance (2006). These policies and the guidance together seek to ensure new development is subordinate in scale and respects architectural character, delivers high quality design and protects local character. The proposal would also conflict with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the emerging Development Management DPD (2016). Whilst these draft policies also have similar objectives they have limited weight as the plan has not yet completed the adoption process.

6. I appreciate that the appellant made amendments to the scheme following discussions with the Council. However, for the reasons I have given I do not consider that these would result in an acceptable development. I note that the appellant considers that the proposal would introduce a modern element to the entire building and that the space of the first floor studio flat would be enhanced. That may be so, indeed on my visit I saw a number of buildings in the immediate vicinity have been refurbished and converted, the effect of which is reinvigorating the appearance of the area and improving the character. Nevertheless, in this case any benefits would be outweighed by the harm that I have identified and the policy conflict that would ensue.
7. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal should be dismissed.

Janet Wilson

INSPECTOR