
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2017

by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 10th July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/17/3172979

94 Pelham Road, Wood Green, London, N22 6LP

- 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 Tony Wilson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2017/0311, dated 18 January 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the loft conversion would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Noel Park Conservation Area (CA)

Reasons

3. Haringey Local Plan (LP) policy SP12, Development Management Policy (DMP) DM9 and Saved policy CSV5 Unitary Development Plan (UDP) aim to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation areas and their settings. Detailed guidance is provided in the Noel Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (CAA).
4. The appeal site is located within the CA which along Pelham Road is characterised principally by terraced properties. The groups of terraced housing are of a consistent scale and urban character, forming strong uniform streets. The appeal property is a two storey terraced house characterised by its traditional materials and strong pitch roof and outrigger at the rear. Accordingly, in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the designated heritage asset concerned is the CA. The appeal building is part of that designated heritage asset.
5. The property is located toward one end of the terrace. The proposal would include the addition of two rear dormers to facilitate conversion of the roof space. The dormer additions would be set in from the side of the roof. However, they would both have a flat roof finish. In addition placing two into the roof would significantly reduce the amount of the additional roof slope that would be visible. Further roof additions are not a common feature of the immediate locality. As a result the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the CA.

6. The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the CA. There has been no firm evidence put to me that there would be any public benefit arising from the scheme that would outweigh the harm caused to the CA.
7. The proposal is therefore in conflict with LP policies SP11 and SP12, DMP policies DM1 and DM9, London Plan policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8, saved UDP policy CSV5 and the CAA. The proposal is also in conflict with the guidance in paragraph 132 of the Framework that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR