

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 October 2020

**by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 11 November 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/20/3255091**

**66 Mount Pleasant Crescent, Hornsey, London N4 4HL**

- 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 BetterPAD against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
  - The application Ref HGY/2020/0682, dated 18 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 13 May 2020.
  - The development proposed is described as flat roof dormer extension to rear with raised/extended ridge height. All facing materials to match existing.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Stroud Green Conservation Area (SGCA).

## Reasons

3. The appeal building is a two storey mid terraced dwelling facing the road. The terrace is largely uniform and traditional in its appearance, displaying an uninterrupted and attractive even original rhythm of windows and doors. The roofline is consistent and punctuated by parapet walls. These elements combine to make a positive contribution to the SGCA. The proposed development would include raising the ridge height of the roof and the insertion of a flat roof dormer window in the rear elevation.
4. By virtue of being on the rear elevation, the proposed dormer window would be well screened from public views, but this would not make it acceptable since it would be visible from neighbouring gardens. It would all but fill the rear roof slope, dominating the quaint traditional design of the dwelling and making it appear top heavy. The pitch of the roof would not change but the increase in the ridge height would be perceptible from the street. Against the consistency of the remainder of the terrace this would appear out of place and awkward, despite how marginal the change would be.
5. These effects would combine to cause harm to the character and appearance of the SGCA. Given the scale of the proposed development, this harm would be less than substantial. As such I am required to weigh it against the public

benefits of the proposal as per paragraph 196 of the Framework. Beyond the additional internal space the proposed development would provide, I cannot see any further benefits to the public. I can only therefore conclude that they would be incapable of outweighing the harm I have found. Harm that would accordingly result in a failure to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the SGCA.

6. As a result of the above factors, the appeal scheme would be contrary to Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP12 of the Local Plan<sup>1</sup> and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD<sup>2</sup>. Together, and amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure a high quality to the design of new development that is contextually appropriate and does not cause harm to the historic environment.

### **Other Matters**

7. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of examples of alterations to roofs and the addition of dormer windows elsewhere in the SGCA. In some cases, the context of changes is different to the appeal site such as that they occur on a curved street and that there are therefore pre existing differences in the ridge height of neighbours. I note specific mention of Nos 38, 44 and 48 but also that these are not part of the same 'run' as the appeal building. Ultimately, I was not party to the circumstances of the planning permissions for the examples cited indeed if they benefit from such. Each development is considered on its own merits, with regard to what and where it is. My conclusions therefore remain unchanged.

### **Conclusion**

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2013)

<sup>2</sup> Haringey's Local Plan: Development Management Development Plan Document 2017