



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2019 by Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu BSc MSc MIEMA
CEnv AssocRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3235918

122 Lyndhurst Road, Wood Green, London N22 5AT

- 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 Mr Dogan Halil on behalf of Anchor Properties Limited against the decision of the Council of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/1670, dated 5 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 1 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is formation of Loft Conversion, involving re-pitching of the roof and the front pediment/raising of the ridge line, the formation of a rear roof dormer extension and the insertion of two rooflights to the front slope and to the pediment.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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.

Preliminary Matters and Main Issue

3. The Council were satisfied that the proposed rear dormer would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the area on account of the fact that it would be obscured from view from neighbouring properties, and the street. I find no reason to take a different view and the determination of this appeal is focused on the re-pitching of the roof and the front pediment/raising of the ridge line element of the proposal.
4. The effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host property and the street scene.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. No. 122 is a first-floor flat which is part of a two-storey mid-terrace property of purpose-built flats, comprising Nos. 122 and 124. It symmetrically adjoins Nos. 120/118. The surrounding area is residential, and the distinctive character is derived from predominantly late Edwardian/Victorian symmetrically adjoined two-storey terrace residential properties with two storey bays to the front. These creates an appearance of a neat and unified street scene.

6. For the most part the bays are terminated by hipped/ turreted roofs which link into the main roof of the dwelling well below the ridgeline. The turreted roofs are a distinctive and attractive feature of the street. There are a few examples where forward-facing gables are used, instead of turreted roofs, particularly on the opposite side of the road. However, the appeal site is situated in the middle of a run of properties, from No. 102 up to No. 140 which share common characteristics, including turreted roofs and symmetrical paired bays. The symmetry provided by the bays and the uniformity in other architectural details, including entrance features and fenestration creates an attractive and what appears to be little altered run of properties.
7. The proposal would increase the ridge height and angle of pitch of the main roof and increase the height of the front bay turreted roof. The scale of the resulting roof and the scale of the bay would be noticeably greater than that of the attached paired dwelling or other properties within the adjacent terrace. This would introduce an incongruous roof form into the otherwise symmetrical pair of properties and would result in an alien form of development. The contribution that the host property and adjoining dwelling make to the appearance of the street scene would be diminished as a result. The roof-form and design of the development would appear out-of-keeping with the external appearance of the dwelling and the form of the extension would be visually harmful to the area's established symmetrical character.
8. The appellant argues there is no consistency to the type and provision of pediments on Lyndhurst Road. As noted above, whilst there may be differing roof forms elsewhere within Lyndhurst Road the appeal property is located within a run of properties which display a high degree of consistency and the proposal would significantly disrupt the rhythm and balance of the row. I note the photographs of similar alterations to Nos 109 and 111 Lyndhurst Road, but the information provided does not give a clear picture of whether planning permission was granted for those developments. In any event, those dwellings form part of a pair and both properties appear to have been extended at the same time, thus retaining a degree of symmetry which is not the case in the appeal proposal. Moreover, unlike the appeal site, which is situated within a run of identical properties with turreted bays, Nos 109 and 111 are situated in a run of properties where front gabled bays predominate. As such, the context for that development is not the same as the development being considered here and reference to other development is not a reason to justify visually harmful development.
9. I find that the development would significantly harm the visual appearance of the host dwelling and is inconsistent with the established character of the area. Accordingly, there is conflict with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2016), Policy SP11 of the London Borough of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2016 (March 2013, consolidated with alterations 2017) Development Management Policy DM1 of the London Borough of Haringey's Development Management DPD (July 2017).

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. For the reasons given above and having had regard to evidence before me, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ifeanyi Chukwujekwu

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree and conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR