



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 November 2017

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 21 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/17/3181922

Flat 1, 11 Wordsworth Parade, Tottenham, London N8 0SJ

- 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 Hasan Yaman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2017/1699, dated 18 May 2017, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2017.
 - The development proposed is the erection of one storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a first floor rear extension to extend the existing studio flat at Flat 1, 11 Wordsworth Parade, Tottenham, London N8 0SJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2017/1699, dated 18 May 2017, 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: A000; A101; A102; A103; A104; A105 and A106.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Hasan Yaman against the Council of the London Borough of Haringey. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The development description set out in the banner heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, I note that the appellant has adopted the Council's revised development description, as set out in the decision notice, in subsequent submissions. The Council's description of the proposal more accurately describes the nature of the proposed development and I have adopted it in my decision, above. In so doing, I am satisfied that neither party would be disadvantaged. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

5. 11 Wordsworth Parade is part of a row of three storey terraced buildings with commercial uses at ground floor and with residential above. The parade faces on to Alfoxton Avenue and Turnpike Lane, with Ducketts Common Park beyond. The parade follows the alignment of Alfoxton Avenue so that at the rear, where there are a number of ground floor build-outs beyond the larger three storey outriggers, each unit in turn is staggered from the next.
6. Although located towards the middle of the parade, the rear of the appeal property is visible in glimpsed views from Alfoxton Avenue. As with the front elevation of the parade, there is a broad consistency in scale and form along the rear of the terrace, despite the broken and fragmented views along it created by the staggered rear outriggers.
7. The proposed extension would be sited at first floor level, above an existing flat roofed ground floor build-out. It would provide an extension to an existing first floor studio flat to provide an enlarged living area. Its dimensions would be limited however, projecting only 2 metres beyond the existing main three storey outrigger. It would also be comfortably set back behind the existing ground floor build-out.
8. The Council consider that the proposed extension would fail to be subordinate to, or in scale with, the existing terrace and would be a dominant and overbearing feature. I disagree. The proposed extension would be a modest addition to the rear of the parade. Whilst it would introduce variation at first floor level, the nature of the staggered outriggers and the extent of the stagger between those outriggers, are such that the extension would not cause harm to the character or appearance of the host property, Wordsworth Parade as a whole, or to the wider surrounding area.
9. Although visible from Alfoxton Avenue, it would be seen amongst the outriggers at the rear of the terrace and would, in my judgment, be neither awkward nor incongruous as the Council suggest. Rather, its scale would be sufficiently modest so as to retain the visual primacy of the staggered three storey outriggers along the rear of Wordsworth Parade, where its limited bulk, massing and scale would be absorbed into the parade's disrupted rear elevation.
10. Thus, for the reasons I have set out, there would be no conflict with the aims and provisions of Local Plan policy SP11, Draft DM policies DM1 and DM12 or with London Plan policies 7.4 or 7.6. The proposal would be sufficiently respectful of local character and would secure high quality design, the latter also being one of the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) core planning principles. Although the Council refer to Local Plan policy SP2 in their refusal reason the officer report does not explain the relevance of this policy to the Council's decision.

Conditions

11. The Council have not submitted a list of suggested conditions. Nonetheless, I have considered the matter of conditions in light of the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. Moreover, given the nature of the development proposed I consider that conditions relating to a time limit for commencement of development, setting out the approved plans and seeking to ensure the use of matching materials, which are necessary in order to provide certainty and in the interests of character and appearance, should be neither unexpected nor contentious, and neither party would be disadvantaged by my imposition of these conditions.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR