
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 August 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 8 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/17/3175879

13 Richmond Road, Wood Green, London N11 2QR

- 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 Ms Sarah Jones against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2017/0227, dated 23 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 22 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as "installation of velux flat rooflights to dormer roof".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. I saw on my visit that a dormer extension has been added to the appeal property and that the roof lights which are subject to the application were in place. I shall therefore treat the proposal as being retrospective but in doing this I have noted that two proposed side windows as shown on the plan have not been installed.
3. The appellant says that the roof extension was constructed under permitted development rights¹ and that the roof lights were added later. Because the roof lights extend above the highest part of the roof the extension including the roof lights would not be permitted development. It has not been demonstrated however that the extension without the roof lights would be permitted development. The Council took the view that the whole development should be considered and its decision was made on this basis.
4. While I note the appellant's comments in this regard there is no clear evidence to justify consideration of the roof lights separately from the rest of the extension, given that the roof lights form an integral part of the extension and cannot be separated from it. On this basis I take a similar view to the Council that the extension together with the roof lights should be considered as the development and my decision shall be made accordingly.
5. The appellant did not agree to the Council's amendment of the description of the proposed development and so I have used the appellant's description as given on the application form in the heading to this decision.

¹ Under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015

6. Since the Council made its decision on the application it has adopted its Development Management DPD² (the DPD). I shall consider the proposal against the relevant policies of that plan.

Main Issue

7. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

8. The appeal property is part of a terrace of houses which have gables facing the street, each house having one slope of each roof. The dormer extension is above the main roof slope and extends to the rear above a lower projecting wing. The repetitive gabled roof form to the terrace is a distinctive architectural form and the development is disruptive in this context. The extension occupies most of the roof slope and obscures the gable wall at the rear, projecting significantly above the rear wing. For these reasons the extension is particularly dominant, bulky and out of character with the architecture of the dwelling and the terrace of which it forms part.
9. I take into account the existence of permitted development rights for roof extensions which are subject to limitations and conditions. The question as to whether the extension without the roof lights would be permitted development is not a matter for me to determine under this appeal. I acknowledge that any roof extension which may be permitted would be likely to affect the roof line of the terrace given its design. However I am particularly concerned at the bulk and scale of the extension to the rear of the property and its effect on the architecture of the building including its projection beyond the rear gable wall. Because it has not been demonstrated that the extension minus the roof lights would be permitted development and therefore that this would be a fall-back position, the existence of those rights does not alter my conclusions.
10. A number of development plan policies require high quality design that respects or enhances its surroundings. Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015) require particular attention to be given to the scale, proportion and mass of existing development and to local architectural character. Policy SP11 of the Strategic Policies³ and policy DM01 of the DPD have similar requirements. Policy DM12 of the DPD specifically requires roof extensions to be of sensitive design quality, respecting the original building. For the reasons given the extension does not accord with those policies and unacceptably harms the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR

² Haringey Development Management DPD (2017)

³ Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2013)