
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/20/3257047

94 Walpole Road, Tottenham, London N17 6BL

- 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 Khalid Maika against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/1308, dated 13 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the retention of additional single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. There are two main issues. These are the effect of the proposed development on a) the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and b) the character and appearance of the area.

Preliminary Matters

3. The appeal building is a two storey terraced dwelling set back from and facing the road. It has rooms in its roof space in a dormer to the rear. There is a single storey flat roof rear extension which contains an extended lounge area and downstairs WC. Prior approval was granted for the erection of a five metre rear projecting extension as a result of notification reference HGY/2015/1969, granted in August 2015. The extension constructed projects over eight metres along the shared boundary with No 92, terminating as an L shape and thus has a slightly shorter projection along the boundary with No 96.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The extension as it occurs along the boundary with No 92, owing mainly to its length, has a significant overbearing effect on users of the garden space immediately to the rear. The height of the extension also garners something of a looming effect on the same space. Whilst it is single storey, the extension is elevated by having been erected on a plinth. The proximity of the extension to the boundary of No 92 is an exacerbating factor, leading to an unacceptably incumbered outlook from ground floor windows. The full width nature of the

extension means it has a similar effect on the occupiers of No 96. Albeit this is slightly tempered by the aforementioned step in the rearmost extent of the projection

5. The extension therefore harms the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. Such that it conflicts with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Local Plan¹ and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD². Amongst other things and in regard to this main issue, these policies set out that new development should be of a high quality design that provides a high standard of amenity. They also seek to ensure that people feel comfortable with their surroundings, development does not cause unacceptable harm to and respects the amenity of surrounding land, buildings and neighbouring uses.

Character and Appearance

6. The extension projects from the rear of the dwelling at ground floor level. It has a flat roof. The length of the extension is substantial and close to the land take of the original dwelling. This results in a dominating and disproportionate addition to the dwelling. Further, the use of a flat roof does not reflect that of the original dwelling which is a more traditional pitched roof two storey unit. Accordingly, it appears as an awkward boxy bolt on feature to the building. The extension is to the rear of the dwelling and thus well screened from public views. This would not however be sufficient to make it acceptable. It remains highly visible from neighbouring gardens in any event due to its size.
7. With this and the above in mind, the development harms the character and appearance of the area. Accordingly, it is contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Local Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD. Amongst other things and in regard to this main issue, these policies seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance, having regard to and respect for local character.

Other Matters

8. Subject to the prior approval process, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of the GPDO³ permits the erection of an extension (for the appeal building) of up to six metres. I do not have an appeal or notification for prior approval before me. Also, what has been implemented on site is clearly not in accordance with that allowed under Class A. In any case, it remains that the extension before me as part of the appeal is harmful for the reasons I have given.
9. There are other extensions to dwellings in the area, some of which I could see from my site visit. Some are substantial but, on my finding, not as substantial as the appeal scheme. My conclusions are therefore unchanged.

Conclusion

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

John Morrison

INSPECTOR

¹ Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013-2026) 2013

² Haringey's Local Plan: Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2017

³ Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)