
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2017

by R A Exton Dip URP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 31st August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/17/3176812

622 Lordship Lane, Wood Green, London N22 5JH

- 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 Robert Fletcher against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2017/0188, dated 21 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as erection of a 2 storey rear extension at first and second floor levels, together with alterations to existing building and creation of four self-contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of a 2 storey rear extension at first and second floor levels, together with alterations to existing building and creation and of four self-contained flats at 622 Lordship Lane, Wood Green London N22 5JH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref HGY/2017/0188 dated 21 December 2016 and the plans and supporting information, 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 Nos 1147/01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06 and 07 all dated December 2016.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan No 1147/07 dated December 2016.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms the corner property of a three storey row on the northern side of Lordship Lane. All of the properties fronting Lordship Lane have businesses at street level with some appearing to have residential uses above. The rear part of the appeal building projects at single storey level along Acacia Road. Beyond this Acacia Road is residential in character. Both sides of the road are lined with modern houses and flats. Taking account of these

surroundings, I consider the appeal site sits in an area of transition in character and appearance from business to residential.

4. The proposed two storey rear extension would have a staggered roof line, with all levels being slightly lower than the existing building. The elevation to Acacia Road would have a varied appearance including blue brickwork and full height glazing to the central stairwell. Whilst it would have a greater visual effect than the existing single storey extension this would be softened by the staggered roofline and varied elevational treatment. As such it would not appear as a harmfully intrusive addition that would be out of scale or character with the existing building.
5. Views of the proposal within the context of the whole row fronting Lordship Lane would be limited. On my site visit I observed the development at the opposite end of the row, on the junction with Winkfield Road, that now forms part of the pattern of development in the locality. By occupying a similar corner site, the appeal proposal would have a similar effect to this when viewed from Lordship Lane. It would therefore not appear out of scale or character with the prevailing pattern of development in the area.
6. Whilst the proposed two storey rear extension would obscure the rear of properties fronting Lordship Lane when viewed from Acacia Road, these do not positively contribute to the character and appearance of the area. The separation distances between the proposal and residential properties on Acacia Road and the obvious transitional nature of this area would avoid any harmful effect on character and appearance.
7. In light of the above I conclude that overall the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. As such it would accord with Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD adopted 2016, saved Policy UD3 of the Haringey Unitary Development Plan adopted 2006, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2016 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan adopted 2015. These require development proposals to be of high quality design that has regard to local character.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above and taking all other matters raised into account I conclude that the appeal should succeed. I have considered the conditions proposed by the Council. These are necessary in the interests of certainty and proper planning and to ensure that the development has a satisfactory appearance. I have amended the materials condition as not all of the proposed materials match the existing building.

Richard Exton

INSPECTOR