



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 September 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/20/3255139

211 Downhills Way, Tottenham, London N17 6AH

- 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 Mrs Orla Dunne against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/0892, dated 17 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2020.
 - The development proposed is Outbuilding ancillary to main dwelling.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. Garages are a common feature within the far back gardens of the western side of Downhills Way. The appeal site already has a substantial garage that would be demolished to accommodate the proposal. This garage is on a scale commensurate with the other garages within close quarters of the appeal site within the terrace to which it relates. It is noticeable that the appearance of the garages within the back lane changes from No. 199 Downhills Way to the south.
4. Whilst I find no harm would arise to the proposed increased footprint, as a consequence, the height at approximately 4.4m to ridgeline, and the effect of the roof form would significantly increase the bulk and mass of the overall building.
5. The proposed roof form would be clearly visible from other residential gardens along the terrace. It would be seen outside the site above the parapet, as it would be higher than the other domestic scale garages immediately adjacent to the site within the terrace, and would be more pronounced given the attached dwelling of No. 209 has a metal palisade rear boundary fence that abuts the appeal site.
6. This proposed increase in bulk of development to the back garden would not harmonise with the prevailing character of the street scene within this part of

the terrace, and would instead result in the consequential effect of appearing as a visually prominent and incongruous feature that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.

7. The proposal would not comply with the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017 DM1 and the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2013) Policy SP11 in their aims to deliver high quality design, especially with regard to relating to form, scale and massing of the locality.

Other Matters

8. There may be a fall-back position for the appellant to explore with regards to permitted development rights. The appellant can pursue this although no comparison has been provided with this appeal, and as is my duty, I am obliged to consider the appeal proposal before me.
9. The modern dwellings with garages at Penniston Close are not directly comparable to the appeal proposal as these are part of the planned Penniston Close development, and that particular street scene. On this basis, the garages both relate, and are read alongside these modern houses.
10. The other examples of garages brought to my attention by the appellant at Courcy Road and Walpole Road are not sufficiently close to the appeal site to be directly comparable and nor do they follow the same characteristics or circumstances as the appeal site. In any case, the Council raises no significant concerns with regards to the impact of this proposal on the adjacent occupiers.
11. The objections to the proposal are noted, however as I am dismissing the appeal, there is no requirement to consider the matters further that are not previously covered in this decision letter.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR