



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 October 2019 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by P J Davies BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/19/3234850

69 De Quincey Road, London N17 7DJ

- 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 Moe Younes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/0994, dated 8 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 May 2019.
 - The development is described as "retrospective planning application for new dwelling house (revision to approved application Ref HGY/2017/4156) to include rear dormer window and hipped to gable roof alterations".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new dwelling house to include rear dormer window and hipped to gable roof alterations at 69 De Quincey Road, London, N17 7DJ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2019/0994, dated 8 April 2019, and the plans numbered TM03111800, TM03111801, TM03111802, TM03111803, TM03111805 and TM03111806.

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.

Procedural Matters

3. Notwithstanding the description given in the application form, I have used the description as set out in the decision as it is more concise. The development has also commenced and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

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

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises an end-of-terrace, two-storey property on the western side of De Quincey Road. The appeal property has a pitched roof and a dormer extension within the rear roofslope. The adjoining property to the east, No. 67 De Quincey Road, has a rear dormer extension of similar scale and materials.
-

6. While properties within the surrounding area are typically characterised by hipped roofs, there is some variety in roof form as Nos. 32 & 34 Waltheof Gardens to the west feature half-hipped roofs. In addition, owing to the position of the appeal property at the end of a long row and its perpendicular orientation to Waltheof Gardens, the gable end forms a logical conclusion that does not result in any obvious change to the prevailing roof styles of the area. The development does not therefore appear overly incongruous within the immediate setting of the appeal site. Although the development is bulkier than other properties within the terrace, its end siting benefits from an open aspect derived from the gardens of nearby properties which offsets its scale. Public views of the development are also limited to a short stretch of road between the junction of De Quincy Road and Waltheof Gardens and the front of the appeal site. These views are further obscured from public views by tall trees set between the flank wall of the development and properties fronting Waltheof Gardens. As such, the development does not appear overly prominent from the street.
7. Compared to the approved scheme, the development has a relatively more prominent appearance within private views from the gardens of adjoining properties. However, this relative increase in prominence is minor and does not result in a visually overly dominant development. Furthermore, the rear dormer does not appear incongruous within the surrounding area as it is balanced with the scale and materiality of the rear dormer of No. 67.
8. I note the fallback position of permitted development rights, however as I have found the development acceptable on its own merits, there is no need to consider this further.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development does not cause an unacceptable level of harm to the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area. The proposal therefore complies with Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD (2017), which states that development will need to achieve a high standard of design, and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), which states that development must respect local context and character. The development also complies with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), which respectively state that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area and should respond positively to the local context in terms of design.

Other Matters

10. I have had regard to the concerns of nearby residents regarding the effects of the development on their living conditions. The development comprises no side-facing windows, and views from the dormer towards No. 32 are oblique. There would be more direct views towards No. 28's garden but these are not unusual in built up residential situations where there is an existing degree of intervisibility between properties. It is not therefore considered that the development results in any unacceptable loss of privacy to properties fronting Waltheof Gardens. Similarly, as the footprint and private amenity space of the development is broadly similar to the approved scheme, it is considered that the development is acceptable in both these regards. Furthermore, due to the distance between the development and properties to the west, it is not considered that the development causes unacceptable harm in terms of light.

Conditions

11. I acknowledge the Council's request for a condition relating to the submitted plans. However, there is no need for this condition in this case as the development has been carried out and the terms of the decision incorporate the plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

P J Davies

INSPECTOR