

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019

**by Sarah Manchester BSc MSc PhD MEnvSc**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 2<sup>nd</sup> October 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3229956**  
**368-370 Green Lanes, London N4 1DA**

- 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 Newrange Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
  - The application Ref HGY/2018/3012, dated 30 April 2018, was refused by notice dated 03 December 2018.
  - The development proposed is ground floor rear extension to hotel.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Newrange Properties Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Haringey. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

### Procedural Matter

3. A Daylight and Sunlight Assessment has been submitted with the appeal. Although this was not before the Council at the time the application was determined, the Council does not dispute the results of the assessment. I have therefore taken it into account in reaching my decision.

### Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effects of the proposed development on:
  - i) The character and appearance of the host property and the area, and
  - ii) The living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring residential properties, with particular regard to outlook and light.

### Reasons

#### *Character and appearance*

5. No 368-370 Green Lanes is a large detached 3 storey with lower ground floor property. It is part of a row of closely-spaced and similar semi-detached properties fronting onto Green Lanes between New River and Hermitage Road. The change in ground levels in the area results in the appearance of 4 storey buildings when viewed from the rear. Several of the properties in the row have

- been extended to the rear, including the appeal property which has a full width 2 storey flat-roof extension to the lower ground and ground floors.
6. An existing planning permission for a large single storey lower ground floor extension to the rear of the appeal property has not been implemented. The appeal proposal is a single storey ground floor extension with a flat roof above the previously approved lower ground floor extension. The proposal would be set in from the side and rear elevations of the lower ground floor extension, which would itself be set in from the side elevations of the appeal property.
  7. While the lower ground floor extension would not be conspicuous from the surrounding area. However, by virtue of its height and depth beyond the extended rear elevation, the appeal proposal would be visually obtrusive. It would appear overly large and incongruous in the surrounding context.
  8. The proposal would be seen in combination with the large lower ground floor extension and the existing extension to the rear of the property. Cumulatively, the substantial bulk of the extensions would appear disproportionate to the original host property. The combined extensions would also be out of scale with, and would not relate well to, the surrounding built environment.
  9. When viewed from locations in the area, including Hermitage Road, Woodview Close and New River, the extensions would create a cluttered and discordant rear elevation. The range of different sizes, shapes, widths and heights of the extensions jutting out from the rear of the property would not result in a coherent appearance and the result would not be sympathetic to the host or neighbouring properties. Consequently, the proposal would not contribute to a harmonious rear elevation. It would not make a positive contribution to place-making or local distinctiveness.
  10. My attention has been drawn to existing extensions to nearby properties. Full details of those schemes are not before me. Nos 364 and 366 appear to have full width 2 storey flat roof extensions similar to that to the rear of the appeal property. However, extensions elsewhere appear more varied in terms of their width, height, depth and roof treatment. Notwithstanding the range of sizes and styles, existing extensions to the rear of the group appear subservient to the host properties. They are not directly comparable to the appeal scheme and they do not provide a justification for a proposal that would be a significantly large and incongruous form of development.
  11. Therefore, and in combination with the lower ground floor extension, the proposed extension would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal property and the area. It would conflict with the development plan, including Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 Adopted March 2013 (consolidated with alterations 2017) (the LP), Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD Adopted July 2017 and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan Adopted March 2016. These require, among other things, that development achieves a high standard of design, having regard to the form, scale and massing of the surrounding built environment in order to contribute to a harmonious whole and makes a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

### *Living conditions*

12. The neighbouring properties to either side of the appeal property are in residential use. No 366 comprises a mix of flats and bedsits. There is no boundary treatment between the rear of No 366 and the appeal property. No 372 comprises four separate flats, each occupying one floor, and it is separated from the rear of the appeal property by a brick wall with a fence above.
13. The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment indicates that the proposal would result in a reduction in daylight to the closest lower ground floor and ground floor windows in the neighbouring properties to either side. There would also be a reduction in sunlight in the rear garden of No 372. However, I accept that the loss of light and overshadowing would not result in significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.
14. The closest part of No 372 to Nos 368-370 has not been extended, and the extended lower ground and ground floors to the rear of the appeal property therefore already protrude beyond the rear elevation of No 372. Consequently, and notwithstanding that it would be set in from the side elevations of the host property, the proposal would contribute to an extensive length of 2 storey side elevation in close proximity to the shared boundary with No 372.
15. By virtue of its proximity, height and length, and cumulative effect, the proposal would be visually obtrusive and overbearing when viewed from the closest windows in the lower levels of No 372 and the adjacent garden. The significant increase in built development close to the shared boundary would also result in a sense of enclosure, particularly when viewed from the lower ground floor and closest parts of the garden of No 372. While the presence of the 2 storey extension to the rear of No 366 would mitigate these effects to a degree, the close proximity of the increased bulk of development to the rear of the appeal property would nevertheless appear overbearing when viewed from the lower ground floor and garden of No 366.
16. Therefore, the proposal would result in significant harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, with particular regard to a loss of outlook and an overbearing form of development. The proposed extension would conflict with the residential amenity protection aims of Policy SP11 of the LP, Policy 7.6 of the London Plan and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the DPD.

### **Other matters**

17. I appreciate that the proposal would create 2 extended bedrooms suitable for use as family rooms. However, there is little before me to demonstrate that this would provide significant benefits or that there are otherwise no alternative proposals that could deliver substantially the same benefit without resulting in the harm that I have identified.

### **Conclusion**

18. For the reasons set out above, the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

*Sarah Manchester*

INSPECTOR