The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2019

by Rachael Pipkin BA (Hons) MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3234777
133, 135 & 137 Turnpike Lane, London N8 0DU

- 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 Polo Investments LLP against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref HGY/2019/0123, dated 19 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 12 February 2019.
- The development proposed is loft conversions and roofs and rear extensions to create two new self-contained flats, together with extensions to two existing flats and storage unit, and facades remodelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Turnpike Lane terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises three properties, Numbers 133, 135 and 137 Turnpike Lane (Nos 133, 135 and 137), which occupy a prominent corner position at the junction of Turnpike Lane and Wightman Road, with frontages to both streets. It forms the end of a long terrace of properties fronting Turnpike Lane, turning the corner where a flat roofed section adjoins a short terrace of properties fronting Wightman Road. The Turnpike Lane terrace comprises three-storey properties with attractive arches to first floor windows and a consistent design of shallow pitched roofs separated by substantial chimney stacks which creates a well-defined, regular rhythm to the roofline which is highly prominent and attractive within the streetscene.

4. The proposed roof extension in the style of a mansard roof would be a substantial addition to this property, which due to its steeply sloping front roofslope and projecting front dormer windows to both street elevations, would increase the bulk of the building. Due to its corner location and the openness of the junction, it would be very prominent within the streetscene.

5. The design of the roof extension would contrast with the shallow pitched roofs consistent through the length of the Turnpike Lane terrace. This would interrupt the rhythmic pattern of this prominent roofscape. The proposed

extension would therefore appear as an uncharacteristic element, incongruous and visually jarring within the terrace.

6. The Wightman Road frontage is less uniform with ridge lines at slightly different heights to each other, and a section of flat roof above No 137. The proposed roof extension would extend across the flat roof terminating beside the shallower pitched hipped roof of the short terrace of properties on this frontage. The steeply sloping shape and bulk of the proposed roof extension would fail to integrate with the design, shape and form of this adjacent roof, against which it would appear overly large and out of keeping.

7. The alterations to the windows of the rear part of No 137 on the Wightman Road façade would improve the appearance along this frontage, and in this regard, the proposal would 'tidy up' the property.

8. My attention has been drawn to a number of examples of mansard roof extensions including to a terrace of properties at the junction of Turnpike Lane and Alexandra Road. This forms part of an entire terrace of properties, unlike the appeal scheme which would only extend above a small section of an otherwise very uniform terrace. Similarly, mansard roof extensions to a property on Priory Road and a former bank on Green Lanes, whilst corner properties, are either adjoined to complete terraces with mansard roofs or are an entirely unique property within the terrace. As such, they are not comparable to the appeal property which clearly forms part of a well-defined, uniform terrace of otherwise traditional pitched roofs in which the proposed roof extension would appear anomalous.

9. I have also been referred to a recently approved development at the Hornsey Tavern which is within a conservation area, and near to the appeal site. However, whilst this is a corner property, it does not belong to such a uniform terrace of properties as the appeal scheme, it is surrounded by properties with more varied roof designs and it does not occupy such a prominent location. It is therefore, in my view, not directly comparable. In any case, I must consider the appeal before me on its own individual planning merits.

10. I conclude that the proposed development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the Turnpike Lane terrace and the surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016[1], Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017[2] and Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017. These policies, together and amongst other things, require development that provides a high quality design appropriate to its context, respects local character and has regard to the form and scale of surrounding development.

Other Matters

11. The proposal would provide 2 additional residential units as well as increasing the size of 2 existing units which the appellant has indicated would be more affordable due to their location above a shop. It would also infill the existing gap between the Turnpike Lane and Wightman Road above No 137, making use of unused airspace. Additionally, it would be within a location with good public

[1] The Spatial Development Strategy for London consolidated with alterations since 2011
[2] Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (formerly the Core Strategy) March 2013 Consolidated with alterations since 2017

transport accessibility. It would also provide some limited economic benefits both during the construction phase and from future occupiers accessing and using local shops. The social, economic and environmental benefits weigh in favour of the scheme. However, they do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the terrace and surrounding area I have identified above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Rachael Pipkin

INSPECTOR