
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 February 2018

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/17/3181514

106 Risley Avenue, Tottenham, London N17 7ES

- 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 Hakan Calabakul against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2017/1299 was refused by notice dated 5 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a 1.15metre side extension (eastwards) to an existing rear extension with a hipped roof to the side elevation of the rear extension with a maximum height of 2.7metres and height of eaves of 2.1metres.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matter

2. At the back of the appeal property is a ground floor extension that has a very shallow pitched roof that appears almost flat. This extension projects outwards from the main rear wall of No 106 and extends across the full width of the main house and beyond its 2-storey flank wall. Consequently, the side elevation of the existing rear extension does not align with that of the main house, which contrasts to the arrangement shown on the plans of the existing dwelling. The Council states that the rear extension is unauthorised.

Main issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the local area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a mainly 2-storey end-terrace dwelling that occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Risley Avenue with Siward Road within the Tower Gardens Conservation Area (CA). The CA covers a wide area and is predominantly residential in character. From what I saw, the CA derives its significance as a designated heritage asset from its well-kept tree-lined streets that are addressed by buildings that are similar in style, age and appearance. With its general consistency in built form and build lines, the CA has the feel of a well-planned residential estate within which many streetscapes are attractive and well mannered.
5. According to the Council, the Tower Gardens Estate Repair and Conservation Guide states that the CA was one of the first garden suburbs in the world and

that its special interest arises, in part, from its uniformity of design. I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, as required by Section 72 (1) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

6. The proposal is, in effect, to replace the flat roof of that part of the existing ground floor rear extension that projects beyond the flank wall of the main house with a lower hipped roof. The resultant side projection would be modest in height and constructed of appropriate materials. The proposed roof would overhang the new flank wall, which reflects the general arrangement over some bay windows and porches of properties elsewhere in the CA. While the proposed hipped roof form would be less conspicuous than the taller flat roof, as built, it would still cover a sizeable built form that would project noticeably beyond the flank wall of the main house. In doing so, the proposal would unduly disrupt the building line of the terrace established by the 2-storey wall of No 106. This arrangement would draw the eye from the adjacent highway despite the partial screening provided by the existing boundary fence. It would undermine a distinctive feature of buildings in this part of the CA, which is the generally uniform build line.
7. With the new built form in place, there would also be an uneasy juxtaposition of different roof forms when seen from Siward Road, with the proposed hipped roof slopes contrasting with the flat roof of the existing rear extension. As the top of the proposed roof would terminate noticeably below that of the existing rear extension there would also be an awkward visual transition between the proposed and existing buildings. As a result, the new side extension would appear as an obvious and unsympathetic add-on.
8. For all of these reasons, the proposed development would be an obtrusive and discordant element to the existing building and the terrace to which it belongs, and thus would be an unwelcome addition to the local area. Consequently, the appeal scheme would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA, to which I attach considerable importance and weight.
9. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that when considering the impact of a proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, such as a conservation area, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Although the harm to the CA would be less than substantial in this case, I am not persuaded that the public benefits of the development, primarily through the support given to the local economy would outweigh this harm.
10. Reference is made to an existing extension at 71 Gospatrick Road, which is also an end of terrace property situated on a prominent corner plot. I saw that the extension to No 71 is visible from the road although its design and scale differs to the proposal before me. As few background details of this scheme have been provided I cannot be certain that the circumstances are similar to those of the appeal scheme. Consequently, it is difficult to draw any meaningful conclusions from this example. During the site visit, I also observed several examples of properties within the CA that had been extended and altered although none were directly comparable in form to the proposal before me or in their relationship to the street scene. In any event, each proposal should be assessed on its own merits, as I have done in this instance.

11. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it conflicts with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan and Policy DM12 of the Council's Development Management DPD. These policies aim to ensure that residential extensions are of a high quality and that development enhances and enriches the built environment and respects its local context and historic significance. It is also at odds with the Framework with regard to the protection of designated heritage assets and also with the statutory duty.
12. The proposal reflects the need to provide additional circulation space for wheel chair use within the kitchen and shower room of the dwelling, which is necessary given the medical condition of the appellant and his partner. Evidence in the form of a letter from the NHS Trust provides further detail, which I have fully taken into account. With greater room to move around within this part of the house the proposal, once complete, would significantly enhance living conditions. I am sympathetic to this desire. However, personal circumstances seldom outweigh more general planning considerations. On balance, this consideration does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified in relation to the main issue.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and taking into account the absence of objections from others, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR