
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2019

by Nicola Davies BA DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/19/3233127

11 Crescent Road, Hornsey, London N8 8AZ

- 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 C & D Patsalides against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/0809, dated 13 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 8 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is roof alterations and extension to detached freehold dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the site address and the description of the proposed development from the planning application form, although I note that these are expressed differently on other documents.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed roof alterations and extension upon the character or appearance of the host dwelling and the area and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Crouch End (Sub area 5: Christ Church) Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

4. The area in close proximity to the appeal site, and within the CA, is characterised by predominantly residential development dating from different architectural periods, although there is a primary school to the north side of Crescent Road. Many of the dwellinghouses are of traditional design and are of 2 and 2.5 storey. There are also blocks of flats close by. The appeal property is one of two similarly designed 2-storey (second storey within the roofscape) dwellinghouses on the southern side at this part of Crescent Road. These dwellings are constructed of matching bricks and roof tiles, along with design features, although I note the appeal property has been extended at its western side.
5. The proposed roof extension would create an additional storey at the central part of the dwelling when viewed from north and south and create a feature

extending upward and elevated above the existing roofscape. It would be almost the same depth as the host dwelling. As such, it would be a considerable visual addition to this dwelling and would appear as a large and bulky addition on top of the existing dwellinghouse. In addition, its design, including the use of zinc cladding, despite being of similar colour to the existing roof slates and dormers, along with its fenestration, would not reflect that of the host dwellings, and this would exacerbate the visual conspicuousness of the roof addition. Furthermore, the low-pitched roof of the roof extension would not reflect that of the existing roof pitch, or the gable ends of the dwelling and, as such, would not reflect the architectural form of the existing property. This would add to the unsympathetic appearance of this addition to this existing property, despite the frontage gable feature being retained.

6. Consequently, I find that the proposed development would be a prominent and dominant feature visually out of keeping with the host property and, given its positioning, size and design, would not be a visually appropriate addition as it would not integrate harmoniously with the appearance of this existing dwellinghouse. For this reason, the proposed roof extension would be harmful. Given the proposed roof addition would be a visually detrimental addition to the host dwellinghouse, it would also detract from, and be harmful to, the visual character and appearance of this street scene and the area generally.
7. I have been provided photographs of other zinc cladding to roof extensions said to be within the area, but I have not been provided with the locations of those developments or the full details of those cases in order to determine what similarity, if any, those developments would have to that of the scheme before me. Although I accept that the existing development along Crescent Road within the environs of the appeal site is of mixed character, I saw no clear examples of any similar additions to dwellinghouses in the locality of that proposed.
8. The appellants draw my attention to the Character Appraisal relating to this CA that describes Nos 9 and 11 Crescent Road to have a neutral effect on this part of the CA. However, the impact upon the character and appearance of the CA needs to be considered in respect to the proposed changes to 11 Crescent Road. Given the visual harm that the roof extension would create, both to the host dwellinghouse and to the area, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
9. I acknowledge that the existing development along Crescent Road within the environs of the appeal site is of mixed character and that the appeal property is the last property to the south side of Crescent Road where mature trees separate No.11 from older residential dwellings in this street. I also note that opposite the appeal site is an existing flatted development at 4 Crescent Road that is positioned next to a traditionally designed locally listed dwellinghouse. I have also been directed to a 4-storey flat block to the west of the appeal site that is opposite locally listed villas.
10. Mindful of all this, the appellants suggest that given the property variation and differing relationships between existing developments in the area, this would provide leeway for some individuality in design within this CA. Whilst I accept all of these points, I do not consider the existence of taller flatted development within the locality or the area being of mixed character would provide sufficient

justification for this proposal that would be out of keeping with and cause visual harm to the host dwellinghouse.

11. The appeal property is clearly visible in public views from Crescent Road and I observed that its existing roofscape can be seen above and through the tree canopy when viewed from Parkland Walk, a vegetated nature conservation area with public pathway south of the appeal site. The visual harm arising from the proposal to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the area, as well as the CA, would be clear and noticeable to existing neighbouring occupiers and to the general public passing by along Crescent Road. It would also be visible in public views from Parkland Walk, although I accept to a lesser extent as trees would partly obscure visibility.
12. The appellants highlight that limited response was received to the Council planning application consultation process and that no objection has been raised by the Council with relation to the living conditions of adjoining existing occupiers. Whilst this may be so there remains the requirement to consider the proposal in terms of the wider public interest.
13. The appellant has directed me to examples of roof extensions at Alyn Court, Crescent Road and 20 Crescent Road. However, those developments relate to existing flatted development rather than to a roof extension to a single dwellinghouse, which is the case here. The design of those roof extensions reflects that of the existing flatted development; therefore, despite being within the CA the circumstances of those developments are quite different to that of the scheme that is before me. It, therefore, appears to me that the proposal before me can and should be considered on its own merits.
14. It is advised that the appellants are willing to agree the final specification of the finishing material as a condition. However, I am not clear whether this suggestion relates to that of zinc cladding or an alternative finish material. Nonetheless, given my findings in relation to the positioning and size of the proposed roof extension, I do not consider the imposition of such a condition would overcome my concerns.
15. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed roof alterations and extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area and that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposal would, therefore, conflict with Policies SP11, SP12, DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017. These policies seek, amongst other matters, development to be of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character. Furthermore, policies also require proposals for alterations and extensions to existing buildings in CAs to complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive.
16. The appellants have directed me to paragraphs 130 and 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The Framework requires development to be visually attractive as a result of good architecture that sustains and enhances the historic environment. When considering the Framework as a whole the proposal would not satisfy the environmental objective in regard to sustainable development.

17. Given the size and scale of the proposal and its relationship with the conservation area as a whole, I consider there would be less than substantial harm to the character or appearance of the CA. In accordance with paragraph 196 of the Framework, I must weigh the harm against the public benefit of the proposal. Although the development would provide additional and improved living accommodation for the appellant and would not result in a reduction in existing garden area relating to the existing property, the benefit to the public, in my view, would be limited, and insufficient to outweigh the harm identified. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would fail to accord with national policy.

Conclusion

18. Having regard to the above findings, the appeal should be dismissed.

Nicola Davies

INSPECTOR