
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 June 2021

by Steven Hartley BA (Hons) Dist.TP(Manc) DMS MRTPI MRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/20/3259017

17 Beechfield Road, Tottenham, London N4 1PD

- 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 Kahn against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref: HGY/2020/1572, dated 16 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as the 'erection of a single storey side to rear extension'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a single storey side to rear extension at 17 Beechfield Road, Tottenham, London, N4 1PD in accordance with the terms of application Ref HGY/2020/1572, dated 16 June 2020 and subject to the following conditions: -
 - i. The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than three years from the date of this decision,
 - ii. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PR-S001, PR-P001, Pr-P002, PR-P003, PR-E001, PR-E002, PL-L001.

Procedural Matter

2. A new London Plan 2021 (LP) was published in March 2021 and this post-dates the Council's refusal notice. This now forms part of the development plan for the area. As part of the determination of this appeal, I afforded the main parties an opportunity to comment upon the implications of this change for the purposes of determining this appeal. I have determined this appeal in accordance with the relevant parts of the development plan including the LP.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon (i) the character and appearance of the property and the wider area and (ii) the living conditions of the occupiers of the property in terms of daylighting.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal building is a mid-terraced property which includes a single storey extension to the rear, allowed under planning permission reference HGY/2019/1746. While the LPA considered that at the time of its decision that the extension had not been completed, I found on my site visit that the external elevations and roof had been completed and that it was in a habitable condition.
5. The existing extension leaves a narrow, linear area of land between it and the boundary to No. 19 Beechfield Road and the application plans show part of the linear gap, up to the boundary line, to be occupied by a single storey addition to the existing extension.
6. The proposed addition would be very limited in extent and as such would not add significantly to the scale or form of the existing extension already constructed under planning permission HGY/2019/1746. Moreover, it would not be seen from any public vantage point and as such would not have any detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the wider townscape.
7. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with policy 11 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Plan DPD 2017 (DPD), policies D4 and D6 of the LP, and with chapter 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework), all of which require a high standard of design.

Living conditions

8. The single storey extension already constructed includes large patio doors and a large rooflight. On my site visit, I was able to see that these are sufficient to provide adequate lighting to the kitchen area.
9. The proposed extension would result in an existing glass door being moved further to the rear, thus possibly giving less light into the internal space behind it. Nevertheless, I was able to ascertain that the kitchen space is not reliant on light from the glass door to give an adequate level of daylighting.
10. Therefore, I conclude that the proposed development would accord with the living conditions requirements of policy DM1 of the DPD and with paragraph 127 (f) of the Framework which stresses the need to achieve a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Other Matters

11. No. 19 Beechfield Road has a single storey rear extension though not as long as that constructed at the appeal property, nor does it extend to the boundary, leaving a path to the rear amenity space. The occupier objects to the length of the constructed extension and considers that its further extension to the boundary would be an infringement to his property.
12. However, a side infill extension of the same depth and height was approved under planning permission HGY/2019/2397 adjacent to No. 19 Beechwood Road and the LPA notes that there have been no policy changes since its approval. The LPA considers that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its

effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No. 19 Beechfield Road and I have no reason to disagree.

Planning conditions

13. I have imposed the standard time condition and a condition to ensure the development is in accordance with the approved plans in the interests of certainty.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Steven Hartley

INSPECTOR