
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 December 2020

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/20/3258593

655 Lordship Lane, Wood Green, London N22 5LA

- 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 Paul Adu against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/1773, dated 25 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'retrospective planning permission for outbuilding to rear to be used ancillary to the existing property.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for development described as retrospective planning permission for outbuilding to rear to be used ancillary to the existing property at 655 Lordship Lane, Wood Green London N22 5LA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2020/1773, dated 25 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The building hereby permitted shall not be used or occupied at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the host dwelling at 655 Lordship Lane.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Paul Adu against the Council of the London Borough of Haringey. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal site is the rear garden to No 655 Lordship Lane and the development is a single storey flat roof building. Used for storage at the time of my site visit, the building has a single front door with flanking window. This gives access to a porch type space which itself is separated by a wall to a larger room. This room has a secondary door to the side, some kitchen type

units to one rear corner and a separate small room that currently contains a sink and toilet to the other.

5. The Council's evidence sets out that the appeal site is one of a small number of 1930s terraced dwellings with generous gardens. Whilst I agree with this to a point, insofar as the gardens may be on the larger side for houses so close to the town centre, for me they do not exude a discernibly spacious character. Given the slope of the land on which the plots are situated, they are terraced which visually truncates their length. The high fenced boundaries garner an enclosed feel, emphasised by the proximity and somewhat looming effect of the gable end of No 2 Coombe Road to the foot of the appeal site. Whilst smaller, there is also a reasonably sized outbuilding at the foot of the rear garden that belongs to No 659, part of the same terraced as the appeal site.
6. With these factors in mind, I would define the immediate area as dense and built up. In this context, I do not feel that the size of the outbuilding necessarily harms the character or appearance of the area, considering also the fact it is almost completely obscured from public views by virtue of the higher boundary between No 655 and 653 and its situation in the rear garden.
7. Taking my findings into account, the development is not contrary to Policies 7.4 or 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, Policy SP11 of the Local Plan¹ or Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2017. Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that new development is of a high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance that is respectful to local character and has regard to form, massing and density.

Living Conditions

8. The outbuilding is of some substance and located close to the boundaries of the dwellings either side. These being Nos 653 and 657. In the case of the former, a substantial timber fence has been erected on the shared boundary which completely obscures the building and thus any effect it subsequently has on users of the garden space at the rear. Space that in any case is open to Coombe Road and appears to be used for off street parking. Furthermore, the outbuilding is stood off the boundary, further reducing the influence it has on the garden space.
9. For No 657, the building is closer to the shared boundary albeit the intervening fence again reduces any overbearing effect it has on the garden for users, limiting views to that of the roof and part of the side wall. In addition, and since the building is sat to the foot of the appeal site's plot, there is a reasonable amount of unencumbered space closer to the rear of No 657 which is on a slightly higher ground level.
10. Taking these matters together, the building does not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, such that it complies with Policy 7.6 of the London Plan 2016 and Policy DM1 of the Development Management Policies DPD 2017. Amongst other things, and in regard to this main issue, these policies seek to ensure that new development does not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of neighbouring land or buildings and a high standard of amenity for a development's users and neighbours.

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

Conditions

11. Given the retrospective nature of the appeal scheme the Council have suggested one condition which seeks to control the future use of the approved building. In the interests of the character of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring buildings and users of the building itself I have imposed this condition. The condition limits the use or occupation of the building to being ancillary to the host dwelling. I have made some changes to the Council's wording in the interests of clarity and enforceability.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons I have set out and subject to the condition imposed, the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR