



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 November 2020

by **P. D. Biggers** BSc Hons MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 08 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/20/3248472

14A Salisbury Road, Wood Green, London N22 6NJ.

- 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 A Karakas against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey Council.
 - The application Ref HGY/2019/3146, dated 6 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is minor scale internal alterations and 3 metre rear extension, 3 square metre front porch to existing property and erecting a two storey side extension to create a 1 bed / 1 person self-contained property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the front porch extension and independent self-contained dwelling to the side and permission is refused for these parts of the proposal.
2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension. Planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 14A Salisbury Road, Wood Green, London N22 6NJ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2019/3146 dated 6 November 2019 and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of approval.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 09004/Proposed Ground Floor Plan; 09005/Proposed First Floor Plan; 09007/Proposed Elevations; 09008/Proposed Site Plan - insofar as these relate to the single storey rear extension only.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the rear extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building in terms of colour, texture, appearance and detailing.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of this terrace of properties in Salisbury Road and the effect on the living conditions of future occupants of the 1 bedroom dwelling in terms of living space.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on the end of a two storey terrace on the west side of Salisbury Road. The terrace is built in brick and render under tiled roofs and there is an attractive symmetrical design and rhythm across the front elevation of the 7 properties in the terrace with its arrangement of gabled peaked dormers and catslide half dormers, consistent roof slope and plot width. None of the properties has any front extension other than the central property where the main gabled feature stands slightly in front of the main façade.
5. In this context the insertion of a front porch extension, extending out 1.5 metres when there is no other such extension in the terrace would introduce an asymmetrical element into the terrace to the detriment of its overall character and appearance.
6. The side extension proposal to create a separate dwelling was originally proposed to simply continue the roofline and front and rear building lines of the terrace. However, in response to the Council's comments and in submitting the appeal, the appellant has asked for Revision A to Drawing Nos 09004, 09005 and 09006 to be considered. Generally, it would be desirable for a side extension to have a stepped down roof and a set-back to ensure it is subordinate to the host dwelling. However, in the context of this terrace of dwellings and given its symmetrical layout and design I am not persuaded that stepping the extension down and back and introducing a lean-to roof over the projecting ground floor would be appropriate. Indeed, it would make the extension more intrusive and incongruous in the street scene to the detriment of the character and appearance of the terrace.
7. I acknowledge that the principle of building on the side of No 14A has been accepted in the past by the permission granted in 2015 (Ref HGY/2015/0780). However, this has now lapsed and, in any event, the development of an extension to an existing property in this location would be materially different to the development of an independent dwelling.
8. The proposal to create an independent dwelling would involve the creation of a separate curtilage, frontage car parking, boundary treatments, separate entrance, and bin storage all within an extremely narrow frontage. The terrace along its length has a regular plot width and the creation of a separate and enclosed plot at one end which is only 2.7 metres wide (less than half the width of the other plots and dominated by the vehicle parking space would appear constricted and incongruous in the terrace adversely affecting its character and appearance. Moreover, the narrow frontage would result in the proportions of window and door openings to solid wall appearing different to those on the rest of the terrace.
9. The living conditions for the future occupant of this 1 bedroom dwelling would be constrained by the limitations of the plot size. The plot tapers front to rear and, in terms of the internal space available, the standards set out in the *London Plan* at Policy 3.5 would not be met. The Policy requires a 1 bedroom building over 2 floors to provide 58 m² Gross Internal Floorspace (GIA). I acknowledge that the standard does not include a figure for single person occupancy of a dwelling over two floors but nevertheless the proposed area of 42m² would be considerably below what is a minimum GIA in the policy.
10. I acknowledge that the appellant has revised the plan layout of the property in Rev A to the drawings and amended the bathroom to be a shower room only so that the floorspace equates to only 37m² - the minimum standard for a one bedroom /

one person unit. However, I find it illogical that the appellant should seek to reduce the space standard further and doing so simply to comply with the policy standard would be pointless as there would be no means of the Council enforcing occupancy by one person only. As an independent dwelling the current owner of No 14A would have no ability in the future to control occupation to one person and it would potentially end up accommodating two people. The result of the proposal would be a dwelling that as a result of insufficient available space would adversely affect the living conditions of its future occupants against the objective of policy 3.5 and Policy DM12A of the *Haringey Local Plan Development Management DPD* (HLPDMDPD).

11. I acknowledge that the location is an accessible one and that the provision of a small dwelling unit, in principle, would contribute in a small way to meeting housing need in Haringey as encouraged in Policy SP2 of the *Haringey Local Plan Core Strategy*. It would also reflect the recognition in the *National Planning Policy Framework* (the Framework) and in the emerging *New London Plan* at Policy H2 that small housing sites can make a significant contribution to supply and constitute the effective use of land. However, paragraph 122 of the Framework is clear that this should not be at the expense of an area's prevailing character and setting. Moreover, Paragraph 127 of the Framework requires that developments must be visually attractive, sympathetic to local character and provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users amongst other things and in these respects the proposal fails.
12. It has been put to me that the 1 bedroom dwelling is to provide accommodation for the appellant's son, giving him access to his own house and helping him onto the property ladder. Whilst I understand this wish I am not satisfied that the need would outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the terrace identified or is a justification for creating a dwelling that would be substandard in terms of its available space. Moreover, I am not persuaded that creating an independent dwelling unit and separate curtilage would be the only means of meeting the accommodation needs identified.
13. In coming to a view on this aspect of the proposal, even if I was to take a more lenient approach in respect of the space standards this would not outweigh the significant detrimental effect the proposed independent dwelling would have on the character and appearance of the Salisbury Road terrace. It would therefore be in conflict with the Framework and HLPDMDPD Policy DM12E which requires extensions to respect and complement the form, setting, architectural characteristics and detailing of the original buildings. Policy DM7 of the same plan specifically guides development on garden land and at part B requires developments to relate appropriately and sensitively to the surrounding area as well as the established street scene and, for the reasons above, the design of the self-contained dwelling would fail to achieve this.
14. Turning to the single storey rear extension to the main house, the design would be very similar in scale, depth and appearance to the single storey rear extensions elsewhere in the terrace and in particular that immediately adjoining at No 12A. The extension would be subordinate to the main house and would not project beyond the rear building line of No 12A adjacent. The overall appearance would be complementary to the character and appearance of the rear of the property and the terrace.
15. As such the proposed rear extension would comply with the requirements of policies DM1 and DM12 of the HLPDMDPD which expect development to a high standard of design contributing to the character and amenity of the area.

16. It is open to me to reach a split decision on appeals, allowing the appeal in part and dismissing other elements provided that the differing elements would not be physically or functionally linked. In this case the rear single storey extension would be structurally independent of the other elements, in particular the side extension, and capable of being built separately and functioning separately. I will, therefore, issue a split decision allowing the appeal insofar as it relates to the single storey rear extension but dismissing it in relation to the front porch extension and side dwelling extension.

Conditions and Conclusions

17. The Council suggested a number of conditions, which I have considered in the light of the advice in the Framework and *Planning Practice Guidance*. A condition requiring development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans is necessary as this provides certainty that the development would be carried out in the form proposed. Control of the materials to be used on the exterior of the ground floor rear extension is also necessary to ensure the character and appearance of the Salisbury Road terrace is not harmed. The Council suggested a number of other conditions relevant to the control of the independent dwelling in the side extension but as I am not allowing this element of the appeal and the planning unit is not changing from one to two properties these additional conditions are not necessary.
18. I have considered the matters before me and for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in relation to the front porch extension and side self-contained dwelling and permission refused for these parts of the proposal. However, in relation to the single storey rear extension the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.

P. D. Biggers

INSPECTOR