
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 July 2017

by J Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/17/3175656

60 Grosvenor Road, Hornsey, London N10 2DS

- 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 Tim Attridge against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2017/0579, dated 13 February 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2017.
 - The development proposed is rear dormer, two front roof lights and half gable roof to enable the creation of a double bedroom at loft level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Vallance Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Vallance Road Conservation Area is primarily made up of a number of residential streets with Arts and Crafts inspired semi-detached houses built between 1909 and the 1920s. The appeal site is a 1920s house on the northern side of Grosvenor Road opposite the junction with Thirlmere Road. In contrast to the surrounding Arts and Crafts houses on the southern side of Grosvenor Road and in the wider conservation area, the terraced appeal property is neo-Georgian in design. The terraced houses at Nos 34 to 90 step in and out in groups of 2 or 3 houses along the street between the junctions of Grosvenor Road with Rhodes Avenue and Grasmere Road, with only one block of later three-storey flats interrupting their uniformity. Although many of the properties along Grosvenor Road have been subject to limited alteration, sections of the street retain a pleasingly uniform character.
 4. The appeal site has a large polygonal two-storey turret bay projecting towards the street. This is an attractive and prominent feature which is replicated on one house in every group of 3 houses along the terrace, creating a regular pattern. The main roof is currently aligned with the roofline of the projecting turret bay when viewed from the street. The proposed development would alter this by introducing a half hipped gable.
 5. The half gable extension would change the relationship of the main roof of the house with the chimney and the projecting turret bay as the extension would
-

extend upwards adjacent to the chimney behind the projecting turret bay. It would fill the existing space between the chimney, main roof and front turret bay when viewed from the street. By filling this gap, not only would the extension alter the house's balance and character, but it would also affect the symmetry of the main roofs of the group of 3 houses at Nos 56 – 60. Given the prominent position of this group of houses facing the junction of Thirlmere Road, this symmetry is an important feature which is characteristic of this part of the conservation area. The extension would be clearly visible from Grosvenor and Thirlmere Roads, both of which lie within the conservation area.

6. I note the range of extensions and alterations to properties in Grosvenor Road and that a number of these developments received permission after the designation of the conservation area in 2008. Although these extensions and alterations have led to some incremental erosion of the appearance of the conservation area in parts, much of its original character remains. Due to its prominence, the proposal would have an erosive and harmful effect on the appearance of the host dwelling and the character of this part of the conservation area. In this regard, the existence of other roof extensions in the locality and the lack of representations do not alter the harm I have identified.
7. The extension would allow for the rear dormer window and rooflights, which the Council has not raised concerns about. I do not disagree with their assessment of the dormer and rooflights. However, I have not issued a split decision in this instance as they cannot be constructed as designed without the half gable element of the appeal.
8. It follows that the proposal would erode the established character of the Vallance Road Conservation Area and so would fail to preserve or enhance its character or appearance. It would therefore be contrary to policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2015) and policies CSV5 and UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan (adopted 2006 and saved 2013). Policies 7.4, 7.6 and UD3 require development to be of high quality design and to have regard to local character, while policy 7.8 sets out guidelines for development affecting heritage assets, including conservation areas. It would also be contrary to policy CSV5 which requires that extensions to buildings preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area. The Council also refers to the pre-submission version of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document (2016), but the plan has not yet been adopted and I consequently give it limited weight.
9. The harm identified would amount to "less than substantial harm" which the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises must be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. I note the appellant's comments with regard to his need for additional bedroom space to meet the needs of his family. While I have some sympathy for this requirement, I have no evidence that the property currently provides sub-standard accommodation. The enlargement of the dwelling would therefore provide a largely personal benefit and I attribute only very limited weight to the public benefits the proposal would make to the wider housing stock. This would be insufficient to outweigh the harm identified. I therefore conclude the proposal would also fail to comply with national policy outlined in the Framework.

Conclusion

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

J Gilbert

INSPECTOR