
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2020

by Mr C J Tivey BSc (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/20/3251374

Ground Floor Flat, 18 Farrant Avenue, Wood Green, London N22 6PB

- 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 Ms Okereafor against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey Council.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/3197, dated 21 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2020.
 - The development proposed is for the erection of a single storey side infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey infill extension at Ground Floor Flat, 18 Farrant Avenue, Wood Green, London N22 6PB, in accordance with the terms of the application ref. HGY/2019/3197, dated 21 November 2019 subject to the conditions set out below:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:1250 site location plan, 1:500 site plan, A102 and A106.
 3. The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal of the design and character of the existing dwelling, and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Noel Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises the ground floor of a two storey mid-terraced house which has been subdivided into two flats. On the whole, the terrace of which the appeal site falls part is well conserved, along with those dwellings fronting the surrounding roads, however it is not uncommon that some have been altered and extended over the years, some relatively recently.
4. There is a single storey lean-to (former outhouse) at the rear, which currently accommodates a bathroom and utility space, this area would be incorporated

into the proposal. The Council states that the proposal would be wrapped around the end of the existing outrigger, however I note on comparing the existing and proposed floor plans that the aforementioned single storey lean-to would not be extended rearwards. As per the description of development, the proposal simply seeks planning permission for a single storey side extension to this.

5. The extension would appear quite contemporary in its appearance and in some ways would act as a foil to the more traditional London architecture of the host dwelling. I accept that the proposed rear sliding doors would straddle the existing flank wall, however in reality this would only be visible from within the appeal site and from limited private views from dwellings at the rear.
6. Overall the side extension would be read as a clear evolutionary step in the development of the property, and would not visually compete with the host dwelling, in terms of its design or scale, with it appearing subordinate in its appearance. In saying this, I note the advice of the Noel Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, however it's quite clear that the Council have recently granted permission for other similar extensions within the locality that would also be built across the full width of their plot. Therefore, on balance, I consider that no demonstrable harm would be caused to the designated heritage asset and consequently I consider that the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be preserved by this proposal.
7. With regard to the effects upon 20 Farrant Avenue, I note that the Council maintains its stance that the height of the proposed extension would not have significant impact on the living conditions of its occupiers, in terms of light and outlook. Concerning the matter of guttering and the thickness of the roof, they highlight that these are matters to be determined under the Building Regulations. I can only determine the plans before me and it's quite clear that the Council is not seeking to introduce additional reasons for refusal.
8. Notwithstanding this, there would need to be some form of mechanism to collect rain water from the new roof and in order for this to remain within the appeal site realistically that could only be through an integral system. If it is found that subsequent non-material or minor material amendments to the design would need to be made, then it would be necessary for the appellant to make an appropriate application to the local planning authority.
9. I agree with the third party, that in itself, the improvement of the internal space of the ground floor flat at no 18 is not a valid reason for the granting of planning permission, however as I have found above, the proposal would not give rise to demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area, that being the main issue identified within the Council's decision notice. With regards to hours of construction work, I note that the Council state that an informative would have been imposed by them if they'd issued a planning permission. Noise during unsociable hours can constitute a statutory nuisance under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and such a nuisance can be enforced through the Council's Environmental Health department.
10. Therefore in summary I consider that the proposed extension would not be out of keeping with the design and character of the existing dwelling, and it would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The proposal

complies with policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, and policies DM1 and DM9 of the Development Management DPD 2017 which together require buildings to provide a high quality design response, having regard to the pattern and grain of the existing spaces and streets, whilst ensuring the conservation of Haringey's heritage assets.

Conclusion and Conditions

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.
12. Other than the standard time limit the Council has also recommended that the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans as listed in condition 2 above; and that the external materials to be used for the proposed development match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building. I consider that these conditions are reasonable and necessary in the interest of protecting the character and appearance of the area.

C J Tivey

INSPECTOR