



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by S Shapland BSc (Hons) MSc MILT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/19/3228860

26 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 Mr & Mrs Kydd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/0222, dated 14 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2019.
 - The development proposed was originally described as "single storey rear extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has altered the description of the development on the decision notice to read "erection of single storey ground floor side infill and single storey rear extension". The appeal questionnaire also uses this altered description. This is a more precise description of the development than the one given on the application form, and I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling; and
 - the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to outlook.

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is a two-storey mid terrace L-shaped property in a residential area. The adjoining properties have a similar architectural rhythm, with outriggers which extend at the rear giving the properties their L-shaped characteristics.
5. The side infill extension is proposed within the existing gap between the outrigger and the boundary with No 24 Richmond Road, and would remove the L-shaped footprint of the building. In the context of the adjoining properties this would be at odds with the appearance of neighbouring dwellings. The removal of the L-shaped characteristic of the property therefore causes harm to the local characteristics of the area.

6. The proposed single storey rear extension would extend approximately 3 metres past the existing outrigger and would be the full width of the site. By extending the full width of the site, the proposed extension would appear as a bulky addition to the host property and would dominate the site. This increased bulk and mass of the proposal would be an incongruous addition to the host building. I therefore find this would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building.
7. The appellants have cited an example of a similar extensions at No 13 Richmond Road and provided the plans of the extension of the property. The example given is of a different design to the appeal proposal as it is not a full width extension and it is not therefore directly comparable to the proposal before me. Consequently, limited weight can be afforded to this example.
8. Accordingly, I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the host dwelling. As such it conflicts with policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 (HLP), policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD 2017 (HMDMPD) and also policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016. These policies seek, amongst other things, high-quality design which relates positively to the character and appearance of the locality.

Living Conditions

9. The appeal site and adjoining properties all have long, narrow, south-facing gardens. The gardens are not straight and the garden of the appeal site splays towards No 24. This means that the proposals when viewed from No 24 would be particularly visible as the design of the extension would follow this existing splaying and encroach into the outlook from this adjoining property.
10. The infill and rear extension would extend a total of approximately 7 metres along the boundary with No24. The narrow widths of the plots mean the proposed infill extension would lead to a small separation distance between the extension and the outrigger and rear wall of No 24. There are a number of habitable windows on the rear of No 24 which would look out directly on the proposals. Whilst the extension is only a single storey, this small separation distance would lead to a feeling of enclosure at the neighbouring property. I therefore find that the proposal would harm the living conditions of No 24 Richmond Road with particular regard to their outlook.
11. The proposed rear extension would abut the rear garden of No 28 Richmond Road and I note the concerns of the occupiers of this adjoining property. However, due to the orientation of the gardens it would splay away from the windows of No 28. Whilst the occupiers of No 28 would experience a change, I do not find that any unacceptable impact on their living conditions would arise.
12. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy DM1 of the HMDMPD 2017 and policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016. These policies seek, amongst other things, that new development must ensure a high standard of amenity for all.

Other Matters

13. The appellants have drawn my attention to their need for this proposal to provide additional space for a growing family. However, such personal circumstances do not outweigh the planning considerations and the harm I

have identified from the proposals. The appellants have also raised additional concerns at the way the Council has advised and determined planning applications at this site. This is not a matter within the remit of this appeal, and my consideration of the proposal which has to be assessed on its planning merits which is what I have done.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

S Shapland

Inspector