



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 20 August 2021

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3268641

First Floor Flat B, 97 Crowland Road, Tottenham, London N15 6UR

- 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 Y Khubani against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/2778, dated 28 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is erection of additional storey on outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the original decision The London Plan 2021 (LP) has been published by the Mayor of London. It comprises the spatial development strategy for London and is now part of the development plan. The policies contained in the LP replace those of The London Plan 2016 referred to in the Council's original decision.
3. In their statement, the Council have commented that Policies D1, D4 and D8 of The London Plan 2021, replace Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of The London Plan 2016 as referred to in the original Decision Notice.
4. On 20 July 2021, the Government published its revised National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'). It replaces the previous version published in February 2019. The Framework represents the Government's up-to-date planning policies for England and how they should be applied. Both main parties have had the opportunity to comment on any relevant implications for the appeal. I have had regard to the Framework in reaching my decision.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal property is a first floor flat located on the northern side of Crowland Road. It is located on a terrace of other residential properties, many of which have been extended and altered. To the rear of the terrace is a two-storey residential development, Platinum Mews, and the South Tottenham Synagogue.

7. The appeal property appears to have been extended upwards through the addition of an extra storey. The property encompasses part of an existing two storey outrigger that is adjoined to the two-storey outrigger of 99 Crowland Road.
8. The proposed development would add an additional storey on the section of the outrigger that serves 97 Crowland Road, resulting in a three-storey structure adjoining a two-storey structure.
9. Due to the resulting increase in height and scale, the proposed extension would create a dominant feature at the rear of the property. The imbalance that would occur with the adjoining outrigger to 99 Crowland Road, would result in a discordant appearance that would be significantly noticeable and create an incongruous addition to the property. Although the main body of the property has been extended by an additional storey, for the reasons outlined above, it would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
10. Although the development would be sited at the rear of the property, it would nonetheless be highly visible from the properties on Platinum Mews and the access to the Synagogue to the rear of Crowland Road.
11. The appellant has referred to the fact that many properties in the area have been extended. I have acknowledged these in my consideration of the appeal, however those that I observed are not the same as the development before me, which I have, in any event, determined on its own individual planning merits.
12. I therefore consider that the proposed additional storey would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan – Strategic Policies (2013) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of Haringey's Local Plan – Development Management DPD (2017) which require, amongst other things, that development is of a high standard of design including for residential extensions.
13. The proposed development would also be contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of The London Plan (2021) which also require good design to be delivered in all developments. Policy D8 of The London Plan, which the Council consider to be relevant, refers to the creation of Public Realm which I do not find pertinent in the appeal.

Conclusion

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

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR

