



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2017

by Stephen Normington BSc DipTP MRICS MRTPI FIQ FIHE

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

Decision date: 25 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/16/3163889

125 Whittington Road, Wood Green, London N22 8YR

- 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 Harry Ibbs against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2016/2930, dated 8 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is described as widening of existing front and rear dormers to the residential property, best match proposed brickwork to the existing brickwork. Reinstall ground floor slate bay roof, replace flat roof with proposed original slate pitched bay roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed widening of the front and rear dormers. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the proposed pitched bay roof and planning permission is granted for the proposed original slate pitched bay roof at 125 Whittington Road, Wood Green, London N22 8YR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2016/2930, dated 8 August 2016, and the plans submitted with it, so far as is relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and 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: 888/A101 ; 88/A103; 888/A105; 888/A106
 - 3) The materials to be used on the external surfaces of the pitched bay roof hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. As a consequence of a grant of probate, the name of the appellant has been changed from that contained on the original planning application and appeal form to Mr Harry Ibbs.
3. On 30 January 2017, after the date of submission of this appeal, the Council granted a Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed formation of a rear L shape dormer roof extension, installation of front roof lights, front bay slate roof and

erection of rear storage area for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling (Ref HGY/2016/3941). This provided for a rear dormer to the property of similar design to that proposed in this appeal but also included a second floor extension to the existing rear outrigger wing of the property with a linking feature to the rear dormer.

4. Consequently, the plans approved in the Certificate of Lawfulness in relation to the rear dormer are different to the ones before me in this appeal. As no other revised plans have been submitted, I have determined this appeal on the basis of the plans considered by the Council which provide for the widening of existing front and rear dormers and the reinstatement of the ground floor slate bay roof with proposed original slate pitched bay roof.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property comprises a two storey, semi-detached dwelling with existing modest front and rear dormers that are set well in from the flank walls, set down from the ridge and back from the eaves. As such the existing dormers appear as subordinate features in the roof slope. Whilst there is some architectural variety in the design of other residential properties on the street, the appeal property forms part of a small building group of approximately eight dwellings that are of similar design. Although these properties have had some changes to the front elevation in the form of porch and canopy extensions at ground floor level, rendering of brickwork and replacement windows, this building group still retains the modest front dormers in the street scene which provide a degree of consistency in the character of this part of the street.
7. The proposed development would involve the provision of a front and rear dormer that would be formed by the continuation of the front and rear elevation brickwork, would extend the full width of the property and have a flat roof positioned slightly below the height of the existing ridge. The side blank gable of the property would be raised to accommodate proposed dormers. At ground level the proposal would involve the provision of a modest slate pitched roof above the front bay window.
8. The proposed dormers would appear as an additional floor to the dwelling as a consequence of the continuation of the front and rear elevation brickwork. As such, their appearance would be seen as an unacceptable bulky addition to the property that would be like no others on the street. In relation to the immediate building group, the front dormer in particular would appear as a dominant and incongruous feature. It would also unacceptably unbalance the appearance of this pair of semi-detached properties.
9. Owing to the height of the extended front elevation of the dwelling, the gable roof of the property, which is also a characteristic feature of the properties in this building group, would not be easily visible in views from the street. As such, the front of the property would largely appear as a flat roof dwelling. This roof form would also appear at odds with the character and appearance of

the building group and further adds to my concerns regarding the incongruity of the proposed development in the street scene.

10. Owing to the arrangement of residential development in the locality, the proposed rear dormer would only be visible from the rear of the gardens of properties on the western side of Whittington Road. The rears of dwellings in the vicinity of the appeal property have had a variety of extensions and roof extensions. As such, there is little consistency in the appearance of the rear of the properties in the vicinity.
11. I have also taken into account the Certificate of Lawfulness that permits the construction of a rear dormer of a similar design to the appeal proposal. Taking this and the locational factors into account, I conclude that the rear dormer, when considered in isolation, would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area of an extent to warrant the dismissal of this appeal on that matter alone.
12. Notwithstanding the existence of the Certificate of Lawfulness, the appeal before me is for front and rear dormers which are inextricably linked by the increase in height and changes proposed to the side gable of the property. As such, in the proposals before me, they form part of a composite scheme that cannot be disaggregated. Consequently, I cannot issue a split decision in this case that would permit the construction of the rear dormer alone.
13. Given the changes already made to the ground floor of the dwellings in the building group containing the appeal property, in which some of the front bays have been incorporated within a canopy roof over front porches, there is little remaining consistency in the appearance of these properties at ground level. The proposed pitch roof over the bay would still retain the bay window as a dominant part of the character of the ground floor of the dwelling. As such this would be an appropriate addition to the property that would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the area.
14. The proposed pitched roof above the bay is a completely distinguishable and separate to the proposed front and rear dormers and can be constructed as an entirely separate entity. Consequently, I intend to issue a split decision that would allow the appeal insofar as it relates solely to this part of the proposed development.
15. Taking the above factors into account, the proposed widening of existing front and rear dormers would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Consequently, this part of the proposed development would be contrary to Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2036 (2013), Saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan Saved Policies (2013) and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016). These policies, amongst other things, require development to be of the highest quality design that respects local context and character.

Other matters

16. I have taken into account the examples provided by the appellant of other dormer extensions permitted by the Council in the locality. Whilst these may demonstrate that the Council is responsive to considerable front and rear dormer extensions, I do not consider that the examples are wholly reflective of

the locational and design factors that apply to the site and proposals in this appeal. Consequently, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.

Conditions

17. Insofar as the conditions relate only to the proposed pitched roof above the front bay window, in addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider it necessary to impose a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans. This is in the interests of certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition concerning the external materials to be used.

Conclusion

18. For the above reasons, taking into account the development plan as a whole based on the evidence before me and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to the construction of a original slate pitched roof above the front bay window and dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed alterations to the front and rear dormers.

Stephen Normington

INSPECTOR