



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2019

by N Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3224882

5 South Grove, Tottenham, London, N15 5QG

- 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 Huseyin Genc against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2018/3791, dated 26 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is second floor extensions to provide additional bedrooms to the existing first floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. Applications for costs were made by Mr Huseyin Genc against London Borough of Haringey and by the Council against Mr Genc. These applications are the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area would be acceptable.

Reasons

4. The appeal site contains a two-storey building used as flats on South Grove. It has a butterfly roof design, behind a front facing parapet, giving it the appearance of having a flat roof when viewed from the road. In that sense, the appearance of the building is distinctive and uncharacteristic in the street scene because most other properties along the road have pitched roofs.
5. Whilst there are taller buildings along the road, including quite near to the appeal site, the majority of buildings are two storeys in height, including the buildings directly on either side of the site.
6. The appeal proposal is, in effect, to increase the height of the building by one storey. Whilst materials could match those used in the existing building, the result would be a prominent form of development that would relate poorly to its immediate context on account of the roof design of the building and its relationship with the lower buildings on either side of it. Accordingly, I consider

that the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area would not be acceptable.

7. As such, there would be a conflict with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policies DM1 and DM11 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document and policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, which, amongst other requirements, seek to secure a high standard of design in new development.
8. Whilst I note that there is no dispute as to the principle of the appeal proposal, the effect on living conditions of neighbours or on highways safety, I consider those to be neutral matters. I accept that the proposal would make efficient use of the site and that it would provide more living accommodation for occupiers of the flat, these factors do not outweigh the concerns that I have identified.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons I have described, the appeal is dismissed.

N Smith

INSPECTOR