



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2019

by Conor Rafferty LLB (Hons), AIEMA, Solicitor (Non-practising)

Decision by A U Ghafoor BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3230517

Flat B, 519 Green Lanes, Hornsea, London, N4 1AN

- 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 G Papathomas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/0117, dated 21 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 15 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is a roof extension to provide additional bedroom to flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council has cited Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 in its reason for refusal. This relates to heritage assets and archaeology and as such is not of relevance to this appeal. In addition, the appellant refers to policies, but these have not been provided. Similarly, the parties refer to 'SPG 1A', but no extracts or copies of this guidance has been provided. I will proceed on the basis of the written representations before me.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located on the western side of Green Lanes, between the junctions with Seymour Road and Warham Road. It comprises a three storey terraced property with a commercial use on the ground floor and residential Flats A and B on the first and second floors respectively. The surrounding area is characterised by similar buildings of a commercial nature at street level, with residential dwellings above. The style and design along Green Lanes is varied, but the immediate western side of the street is primarily made up of buildings which retain a consistency in terms of architecture, materials and character.
6. The proposed development relates to the installation of a roof extension to the second floor residential flat at the property for the purposes of providing an additional

bedroom. This would be set back from the front elevation of the property and finished in materials to match the existing roof. The extension would largely not be visible from the western side of the street and would be further screened from certain vantage points by the roofs of neighbouring dwellings.

7. Nonetheless, the full width scale of the extension would introduce a feature to the dwelling that would not respect the scale or character of the property. It would be visible from the eastern side of Green Lanes immediately opposite and from further viewpoints on the street when approaching the property. Distant views would also be possible from Warham Road. From these views the proposal would dominate the front roof profile and, in doing so, would cause visual harm to the external appearance of the appeal property. It would appear disproportionate in the context of the building itself but would also reduce the sense of coherence with the front elevations of the neighbouring, attached dwellings.
8. Buildings along Green Lanes are varied in their architectural style. While a roof extension can be seen in the vicinity, these are not common features of the immediate location. The proposal would represent an addition to the area that would not respect the local context or complement the surrounding character. It would create a break in the level of similarity in the nature of the properties within this portion of the street scene. The development would disturb the rhythm of the settlement pattern when experienced with the neighbouring dwellings. The proposal would not relate positively to the properties in the street scene and it would appear incongruous in the immediate setting.
9. I find that the development would have a visually harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies 7.4 or 7.6 of the London Plan 2016; Policy DM1 of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey Development Management DPD adopted in July 2017; or Policy SP11 of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. Having had regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I too agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

A U Ghafoor

INSPECTOR