



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2017

by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

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

Decision date: 2 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/17/3174569

80 Beechwood Road, Hornsey, London N8 7NG

- 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 John Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2017/0037, dated 8 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a double storey side extension, single storey rear extension & loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Campsbourne Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the CA, which is predominately characterised by 2 storey terrace houses. The eastern end of Beechwood Road consists of short terraces where each end terrace property has a forward projecting gable. This creates a rhythm and symmetry in each short terrace. There is also an approximate mirroring between each short terrace with those that sit opposite each other. This regularity is a significant feature of this road and it contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. The appeal dwelling is an end terrace property with a characteristic forward projecting gable. At its side there is a single storey flat roofed extension which projects forward of the front wall of the gable. It has been constructed of similar materials and with windows of a similar design to those found in the main house. The appeal site is wider at the front and narrows towards the rear of the building so that the area to the side and the existing extension is roughly triangular in shape.
5. The development would result in the addition of a side extension with a lengthened ridge line and the side wall of the first floor located above that of the existing single storey extension. Sitting on the far side of the forward projecting gable, the side extension would result in the loss of the gable as the terminating feature on this terrace above ground floor level. It would erode its symmetry and the approximate mirroring of the houses opposite. The angled side wall would be more prominent than is currently the case with the ground floor extension. This would be out of keeping with the otherwise simple and regular form of the terrace. Although the gable would still project forward of the front wall of the side extension this would not minimise the harm that

- would arise through the loss of the regularity in the terraces. The side extension would appear as a harmfully discordant feature and undermine the character and appearance of the CA.
6. The extension would not result in the removal of the forward projecting single storey extension to the side. It would be retained and an area of flat roof would project forward from the proposed front wall of the first floor. I accept that this side extension has, to a degree, interrupted the symmetry of this short terrace and the mirroring effect with No.77 opposite. However, above ground floor level, the rhythm and symmetry of the street is still retained so the existence of this extension does not justify the development. The proposed extension would also do nothing to harmonise the appearance of the forward projection of the existing extension at ground floor level.
 7. With the use of roof lights of an appropriate design I consider that they would not have an over dominant or harmful effect, and in its self the rear dormer window would not be prominent from the street. These factors would not however mitigate or minimise the harm that would arise from the side extension.
 8. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. This is a matter of considerable importance and weight. The extension would be seen from a small section of the CA and consequently the extent of the harm to the heritage asset would be "less than substantial" in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework. However, no substantive public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.
 9. For these reasons the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such it would be contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6, and 7.8 of the London Plan, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026, and saved Policies UD3 and CSV5 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan. These policies seek to ensure that development is of a high standard of design so that the significance of heritage assets are conserved, the character of a conservation area is preserved or enhanced, and the character and local sense of place is respected.
 10. The Council has not raised concerns in respect of the effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and I note that no parking is proposed to the front of the property. These factors indicate a lack of harm but do little to weigh in favour of the development. I note that there was some support for the development, suggesting that it would limit the views of the dormer windows on properties in Nightingale Lane. However, I consider that the harm to the CA would not be outweighed by this factor.

Conclusion

11. The adverse effects of the development are sufficient to mean that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. Although some private benefits would arise for the appellant due to an increase in floor space, this would not outweigh the harm. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR