
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by D Guiver LLB(Hons) Solicitor

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

Decision date: 22 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/17/3166671

Flat B, 84 Hermitage Road, Tottenham, London N4 1NL

- 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 Ms Shirley Burns against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/1617, dated 19 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a loft conversion at Flat B, 84 Hermitage Road, Tottenham, London N4 1NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2016/1617, dated 19 May 2016, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 01E.
 - 3) The external materials to be used in the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a first-floor flat in a converted house, which is the penultimate property in a long terrace of conventional, two-storey dwellings, with small rear gardens. The houses are built in a traditional style, with end-terrace houses having hipped roofs.
 4. Close to the appeal site are two dwellings with rear extensions similar to the proposed development in terms of design and scale. The first of these dwellings is the neighbouring property at 86 Hermitage Road. The second dwelling is at 80 Hermitage Road, which is the house at the end of the neighbouring terrace. Between the appeal site and No 80, is 82 Hermitage Road and between No 80 and No 82 the terraces are separated by a residential
-

- street, Vale Grove, comprising similar dwellings. No 82, as an end-terrace property, has a hipped roof.
5. The extension at No 86 is not visible from the front elevation. I find that the proposed development would be similarly screened and therefore would not cause harm to the street scene or the consistent roof line on Hermitage Road.
 6. Upon entering Vale Grove, the extension at No 86 is screened at street level by an existing two-storey structure that runs parallel to the street and forms the rear elements of No 82 and No 84. The extension only becomes visible when standing 25 metres or so further along Vale Grove, at which point the materials used in construction result in the structure being barely discernible from the existing roof line.
 7. As with the extension to No 86, the proposed development would be partially screened from Vale Grove, but being closer to the end of the terrace would be more visible. However, a similar effect in terms of the proposed development being visible in the existing roof line could be secured by condition requiring external materials used in the development to match those in the existing building.
 8. The proposed development would alter the main pitch of the host property but would match the extension at No 86, which has changed the pitch and silhouette of the roof line immediately adjacent to the appeal site. The extension to No 86 has also increased the mass of the roof line adjacent to the appeal site to such an extent that the proposed development would be subordinate to the roof mass as a whole.
 9. By contrast, because it sits on the property's side-elevation and boundary with the street, the extension at No 80 is visible from Hermitage Road looking into Vale Grove. This extension has a box dormer similar to that envisaged in the proposed development and it appears that a hipped roof has been replaced with a gable. The proposed development would be significantly less visible than the existing extension at No 80.
 10. A smaller extension at the appeal site set in from the boundaries and constructed away from the apex and eaves would stand in stark contrast to the dominant structure at No 86 and would be incongruous. As proposed, the extension would be seen as a balanced pair with that at No 86. Therefore, in these circumstances, I consider that the proposed development would be of a high standard of design that would mirror a pre-existing structure and would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building or the area as a whole.
 11. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would comply with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2013 which together seek to ensure developments deliver high quality design. I also conclude that the proposed development would comply with Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG1a 2006 which seeks to ensure developments are of an appropriate scale.
 12. The Council has referred to draft Policies DM1 and DM12 of the emerging Haringey Development Management Policies DPD (the Emerging Plan), which together seek to ensure high quality design and appropriate scale in new developments. The Emerging Plan Policies are at a late stage in the adoption

process and are consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Therefore, pursuant to paragraph 216 of the Framework I give significant weight to these Policies but consider that the proposed development would comply with them as they do with the current policies mentioned above.

13. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions and in addition to the standard time-limit condition for development I consider that the approved-plans condition is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. A condition in relation to materials is necessary for the reason given in paragraph 7 above.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

D Guiver

INSPECTOR