



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 July 2019

by M Chalk BSc (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 July 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/19/3228840

37 Lansdowne Road, Hornsey, London N10 2AX

- 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 Emer Roy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/0150, dated 4 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as a roof extension including a rear dormer, new side gable, the raising of the height of the existing ridge and the insertion of three roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development has been taken from the Council's decision notice. This includes specific reference to the proposed side gable, which was not separately referred to on the application form, and is a more precise description of the proposed development.
3. I note that the submitted plan D08 shows the proposed elevations of no 37 if the proposed development were to be carried out. However, the front elevation does not show the proposed side gable extension. Although the gable is shown on other elevations and plans, its omission from the front elevation does not illustrate an accurate representation of the proposed development. No amended plan addressing this omission has been presented for consideration and, notwithstanding any other considerations, allowing the appeal in the absence of accurate plans may prejudice the rights of third parties who could have potentially been misled by the inaccurate plans. I must determine this appeal on the basis of the information submitted, which is what I have done in this case.

Main Issues

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Vallance Road Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site lies within the Vallance Road Conservation Area. As such I am mindful of my statutory duty under section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed

Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. The significance of the Conservation Area derives from the layout, scale, form and architectural details of the residential streets and houses, and from the collective consistency in scale, form, style and materials.

6. Lansdowne Road rises steeply from the junction with Grove Avenue, with the appeal property occupying a corner plot at a bend in the road. The rear of the property is in prominent view from the Grove Avenue junction and along the approach to the bend.
7. The appeal property is a detached house and as such is notable against the predominant character of the other houses in the road, which is defined by terraced or pairs of semi-detached houses. The appeal property has an existing two-storey side projection which is not characteristic of the surrounding area as it is the only flat-roofed structure of this size visible in the surrounding area. Although the appeal property has a different character than neighbouring properties, it generally reflects the scale and layout of neighbouring properties.
8. The proposed extensions to the roof, and particularly the rear dormer and raising of the ridge, would significantly increase the mass and bulk of the roof and the consequential prominence of the appeal property, particularly from the Grove Avenue junction. The proposed dormer by reason of its depth and width would result in the near-total loss of the rear roof slope and the rear gable which reflects the prevailing character of two-storey houses with pitched roofs in the street and wider area. The impact of the development would result in the appearance of a three-storey flat-roofed house when viewed from the public realm to the rear, making the appeal property appear more bulky, overly dominant and obtrusive, and unsympathetic to the character of the area.
9. The proposed development would therefore harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The harm is less than substantial to the significance of the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset when assessed against paragraphs 193 and 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework. No public benefits have been presented to me that would outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area in this case.
10. The appeal scheme would conflict with policy DM9 of the Development Management Plan DPD (Adopted July 2017) which seeks, among other things, that in Conservation Areas new development should not appear overbearing or intrusive. It would also be contrary to policy SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (adopted March 2013) (the SP) and policy 7.8 of the London Plan (adopted March 2016) which together seek that new development affecting heritage assets such as conservation areas conserve and enhance their character and significance, and policy SP11 of the SP which requires that all new development should enhance and enrich Haringey's built environment.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I dismiss the appeal.

M Chalk

INSPECTOR