



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2019

by Patrick Hanna MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3224813

88 and 90 Elm Park Avenue, Tottenham, London N15 6UY

- 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 Goldberg against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/0297, dated 15 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of part one, part two storey rear extensions to Nos 88 and 90.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of part one, part two storey rear extensions to Nos 88 and 90 at 88 and 90 Elm Park Avenue, Tottenham, London N15 6UY in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2019/0297, dated 15 January 2019, and the plans submitted with it, 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: 436-L&B; 436-EX01; 436-EX02; 436-EX03; 436-P01; 436-P02; and 436-P03.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in materials to match the colour, size, shape and texture of the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. I have corrected the appeal address to reflect the appeal description and drawings.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the locality.

Reasons

4. The application site comprises two mid-terrace two-storey dwellings. The character of the area is residential and largely uniform, predominantly long terraces of two-storey dwellings, but with a considerable number in the wider

locality having been extended upwards to three storeys. The proposal is for a paired extension to the rear.

5. The House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) states that two-storey rear extensions are generally discouraged. However, this policy is justified on grounds of potential harm to living conditions of neighbours, not character and appearance.
6. Whilst the existing terrace is largely unaltered, with the exception of some small ground floor extensions, this does not in itself justify refusing further development. The pairing of the proposal results in the first-floor extension being set-back from neighbouring boundaries, and the low roof pitch minimises the overall bulk of the form. To my mind, the first-floor element of the proposal is designed to minimise visual impact. Furthermore, the proposed extension would only be glimpsed in passing from the public realm. The proposal would not be seen at all from Elm Park Avenue, and the viewpoint from the Ferndale Road school entrance would be side-on and very restricted. Any views from the school sports ground are screened with boundary landscaping. Consequently, I find that the appeal proposal would not cause harm to the locality.
7. The Council previously found upward roof extensions at the appeal properties to be acceptable, although I do not have drawings or details of those permissions. The SPD contains presumptions against particular types of rear extensions which are allied to upward extensions; the appeal proposal does not fall within those categories. In terms of cumulative impact on the locality, the lack of harm I have found to the public realm from the appeal proposal would be unaffected by the construction of any separate upward roof extension.
8. As a consequence, the proposal has no adverse effect on the character and appearance of the locality. It would thus comply with Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document, Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies, Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, and the Haringey House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document, which together require development to relate positively to the distinctive character of the local area amongst other matters. Whilst I find no direct conflict with Policy DM3 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document, it is of limited relevance to this appeal.

Other matters

9. I note concerns from a neighbour about impact on light, privacy and enclosure. However, the Council do not object on these grounds and, given the orientation of the proposal, the set-back from mutual boundaries, and appropriately positioned windows, I see no reason to disagree.

Conditions and conclusion

10. For the reasons above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and planning permission granted subject to conditions that are necessary in the interests of certainty, and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Patrick Hanna

INSPECTOR