



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2020

**by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3225867**

**263 Mount Pleasant Road, Tottenham, London N17 6HD**

- 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 Schriber against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
  - The application Ref HGY/2019/0472, dated 29 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 27 March 2019.
  - The development proposed is the retention of the rear roof dormer on top of the main house together with the change of use from a single dwellinghouse to three flats (1x3-bedroom 4P, 2x1-bedroom 1P).
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. The dormer window identified in the description of development above has already been constructed in line with submitted plans. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that retrospective permission is sought for this dormer as built.
3. A second dormer has already been constructed along the two-storey rear outrigger at No 263. Whether or not this structure is lawful in planning terms is not a matter for me to determine in the context of this appeal. However, correspondence between the main parties indicates that the Council consider this feature to be lawful. I have therefore assessed the appeal proposal on the basis that this dormer is part of the existing building.

### Application for Costs

4. An application for the full award of costs was made by Mr Schriber against the Council of the London Borough of Haringey. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

### Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and area.

### Reasons

6. No 263 is a two-storey, terraced, dwelling located on the western side of Mount Pleasant Road. Dwellings on this side of the street have projecting bay windows and front facing gables and are constructed under simple, largely unaltered, pitched roofs. In addition, they share two storey rear outriggers with pitched roofs

which remain mostly unaltered. Such common features give these properties a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity. The existing box dormer window at the outrigger of No 263 occupies a large portion of this outrigger's roof and sits above its ridge height. Consequently, this dormer has already eroded the simple roofscape of the host property, thereby adversely affecting the rhythm and uniformity of the terrace.

7. Amongst other things, this proposal seeks permission for the box dormer window within the main rear roof of No 263. This dormer does not exceed the width of the existing outrigger dormer. Nevertheless, it occupies a large part of the main roof slope, being close to its ridge, the main eaves and the boundary with 265 Mount Pleasant Road. It therefore seriously erodes the simple design of the original roof. This is particularly harmful when considered in combination with the dormer which has already been constructed at the outrigger. Together, these features have resulted in significant harm to the rhythm and uniformity of the largely unaltered roofscape of the terrace as a whole.
8. Consequently, I am not persuaded that the dormer in the main roof infills an unsightly void or assists with integrating the outrigger dormer with the rest of the property. On the contrary, it reinforces the harm caused by the loss of form and shape of the original roof. I consider this to be the case even though the main roof dormer is not conspicuous from the street, as it can be clearly seen from the rear of No 263 and several other nearby properties.
9. For the reasons given, the proposal harms the character and appearance of the host property and area. It therefore conflicts with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD, Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies and Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that proposals are high quality in design, relate positively to their locality and enhance the built environment.

### **Planning Balance**

10. The Government is seeking to significantly boost the supply of housing. There is no objection to the principle of the intensification of the residential use of the site. The determining factor is whether or not this can be achieved without harm to the local environment.
11. The proposal would provide adequate living conditions for future occupants. However, this is a requirement of the development plan and would not outweigh the harm that I have identified to the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace to which it belongs.
12. Overall, the adverse effects outweigh the benefits associated with the proposed residential intensification. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the advice of the National Planning Policy Framework, which outweigh this conflict.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*M Heron*

INSPECTOR