



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2019

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3237672

4 Endymion Road, Hornsey, London N4 1EE

- 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 Kalinicos Georgiou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/1780, dated 8 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the construction of a mansard roof extension to facilitate a loft conversion and installation of an external fire escape staircase at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a house of three-storeys and basement sitting in a short terrace of six similar properties. It is divided into self-contained flats. Common features in the terrace include crown roofs and raised open porches, along with prominent triangular gables and two-storey bay windows to the front elevation. These give it a considerable coherence and orderliness when viewed from the street. The same is true of the rear of the terrace which can be seen from the long back gardens and from Wightman Road. Within the terrace there are some small differences at roof level, with No 2 having a box dormer on the side of its front elevation next to the gable, and each property within the block having a rear dormer varying in size or design from its neighbours. Nonetheless, for the most part the block reads as a coherent whole, with the basic symmetry and repetition of design features giving it a solid and orderly character.
4. The proposal is to replace the existing roof, which would allow the headroom to be increased in the existing rooms at second floor level, and to install a steel framed external staircase with a new door providing egress from the landing between ground and first floor levels in the rear outrigger.
5. The altered roof would not be a true double-pitched mansard roof, but a crown roof with steeper front and rear pitches than at present. It would rise to the same height as the existing roof and would retain the front gable wall, with three small dormers set into the rear slope. The steeper pitch of the roof would

be at odds with the original roof slope of the neighbouring properties in the terrace. It would also reduce the prominence of the front gable, thereby diminishing its contribution to the repetitive orderly character of the terrace. At the rear, although the dormers would repeat the fenestration of the windows below, the steeper angle of the roof pitch mean that the roof would again appear disjointed from its neighbours. Taking these points together, I consider that the altered roof would give the host property a top-heavy appearance, and would be bulky and incongruous within the block as a whole.

6. The appellant has drawn my attention to another roof on Endymion Road which is similar to the appeal proposal, and has indicated that there are others in the wider area. From what I observed on my site visit mansard-style roofs are not a characteristic feature of the neighbourhood. I do not know the circumstances which led to the other roof being erected, but that an example exists elsewhere on the same street is not in itself a reason to allow unacceptable development which would cause harm as described above.
7. The external staircase would be a basic and functional steel framed structure. It would be very visible because of its height and its position at the end of the rear outrigger. As a consequence of these factors it would be a prominent and intrusive feature when seen either from the rear gardens or from Whiteman Road.
8. Although there is already an external steel staircase at No 1, this serves the raised ground floor level and is set against the main rear elevation of the block, so it is neither as tall nor as prominent as the proposal before me. The appellant has also drawn my attention to several other fire escape stairs in the wider area. I agree with the appellant's analysis that the examples provided are intrusive when seen from streets, other public spaces and neighbouring properties. The proposed staircase before me is not as large as some of the other examples, but nonetheless neither its materials or design would respect the character and appearance of the host property or its terrace. Again, that there are already external staircases nearby which detract from the appearance of their host buildings and the surrounding area is not a reason to allow further unacceptable development in this case.
9. I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and terrace. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the 2016 London Plan, Policy SP11 of the 2017 Haringey Local Plan and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the 2017 Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document. These policies together require development to be to be well-designed, and to respect and complement local characteristics including architectural style, form and detailing.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector