
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2020

by David Murray BA (Hons) DMS MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3236704
549 High Road, London, N17 6SB.

- 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 H Guzel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref. HGY/2019/1825, dated 23 June 2019, was refused by notice dated 29 August 2019.
 - The development proposed is the change of use of the ground and first floor extension located to the rear of the main building to A2 office use and erection of a first floor element of the extension (part retrospective)
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the change of use of the ground and first floor extension located to the rear of the main building to A2 office use and erection of a first floor element of the extension at 549 High Road, London, N17 6SB in accordance with the terms of application Ref. HGY/2019/1825, dated 23 June 2019, and the plans submitted with it.

Preliminary matter

2. I have used the description of the development agreed with the Council which is different to that set out in the application forms.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area including the Bruce Grove Conservation Area.

Reasons

Background

4. The appeal site adjoins a three storey building which lies to the rear of frontage premises and the application forms say that the overall building is divided into nine self-contained flats, a café and an office. There is an extensive flat roof extension to the side of the building and the proposal is to add an additional floor over part of the existing roof and on the rear corner of the building. I noted at my site visit that the physical extension has already been carried out and therefore this part of the proposal is retrospective.
5. The appeal site forms part of the Bruce Grove Conservation Area and the site also lies opposite a single storey stone building (No.551B) with a portico with columns

and a pediment over the entranceway but no party had provided information on this building or any historical or architectural designation. Nevertheless, I have had regard to the setting of this building in my assessment of the proposal.

Effect on character and appearance

6. From my reading of the relevant planning policies there does not appear to be an objection in principle to the formation of an A2 use in this location. The main issue is the nature of the addition to the existing building.
7. The submitted plan shows the first floor extension in fairly stark engineering terms but in real life the work has a better and more sympathetic appearance in its setting with the host building where the corner wall is rounded and reflects the historic footprint of the site as shown on the site plan. Moreover, the extension is constructed in good quality London stock bricks which reasonably match the new three storey extension to the rear. Although there is a clear line between the old and new brickwork this appears to me to be because of the weathering of the older brick and this contrast is likely to diminish with age and become less noticeable. In terms of the roof of the extension, the outward face is finished with a coping stone and although there appears to be a felt roof behind leading down to an edge with a gutter, this is similar to the form of the eave on the three storey extension.
8. When viewed from around the site the extension fits in with the scale and form of its surroundings and is visually subservient to the much larger host building and any disruption to the symmetry of this building is not visually significant. I also considered the visual effect of the extension when approaching westwards from the High Road, but I do not agree with the Council that the extension dominates the view or the relationship with neighbouring buildings including the stone building with pediment.
9. I am satisfied that the overall appearance of the extension is visually sympathetic to the architectural form of the host building and the setting of neighbouring ones. The work preserves both the character and the appearance of the Conservation Area and does not harm it. In forming this view, I have taken account of the representations of the Tottenham Conservation Area Advisory Committee, but I do not agree that the extension has a negative effect on the significance of this heritage asset.
10. Overall, I find that the proposal meets the requirements of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan; Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017 and Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD as having a positive architectural form sympathetic to the local character and distinctiveness of the site and locality. This accord with the development plan is not outweighed by any other consideration and this indicates that the appeal should be allowed. I do not consider that any conditions are necessary.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

David Murray

INSPECTOR