



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 June 2021

by M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th September 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3267743

First Floor Flat, 48 Antill Road, Tottenham, London N15 4BA

- 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 A Lipschitz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/2898, dated 3 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a rear dormer and roof extension including the insertion of 2 front rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development used in the banner heading above is taken from the appeal form, as it includes a reference to front rooflights which are shown on the proposed drawings but were not mentioned on the original planning application form.
3. The Council's decision notice referred to policies of the London Plan 2016. These were superseded by the policies of the London Plan 2021 which was published and became part of the development plan on 2 March 2021. Although the Council was invited to do so, it has not provided information as to whether or not it considers that the proposed development conflicts with policies of the 2021 London Plan. My reasons below therefore make no reference to the current London Plan.
4. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") on 20 July 2021, replacing the version published in February 2019. In this case, the amendments to the Framework have not had a significant bearing on the most relevant issues in this appeal. I am therefore satisfied that there is no requirement for me to seek further submissions on the revised Framework, and that no party's interests have been prejudiced by my taking this approach.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a two-storey end terraced house on a predominantly residential street characterised by rows of two-storey terraced houses with closet wing outriggers to the rear. Although there is some variety in the apparent ages and detailed design of the housing blocks on Antill Road there is an overwhelming uniformity of scale, which gives the street a neat appearance and an orderly character. Where rear extensions have been built (whether backwards or upwards) these are not generally visible from the street. Part of what was previously the rear garden of No 48 has been separated to provide a separate modern dwelling, now known as No 48A Antill Road – while that building has a distinctive appearance deriving from its design and materials, it does not in itself detract from the apparent visual quality of the surrounding older housing.
7. The appeal property is currently formed into two self-contained flats, one on the ground floor and another on the first floor. The proposed development is the erection of a rear dormer on the rear pitch of the main roof, along with a further flat roofed extension above the rear outrigger, as well as two rooflights on the front pitch of the main roof. These works are intended to facilitate the conversion of the existing two bedroom flat on the first floor into a three bedroom flat occupying the first and second floors.
8. The appeal site is located on the inside of a bend in Antill Road. As a consequence the rear upper floors and roof are clearly visible from that part of the street west of the appeal site. The positioning of both the proposed rear dormer and, in particular, the large extension above the outrigger means that both would become prominent features in the streetscape. From Antill Road, they would dominate and overwhelm the existing host building, to the detriment of the character and appearance of No 48 itself and the wider area.
9. The appellant has drawn my attention to rear extensions above outriggers elsewhere nearby, including at Nos 45, 47, 51, 69, 74, 108, 116 and 118 Antill Road. These examples are all in positions which cannot be seen from Antill Road itself, so I was not able to view them for myself at the time of my site visit. Consequently I can only rely on the aerial photographs provided by the appellant which, to the limited extent that they can do so, show what to my mind are mostly bulky, cumbersome and unattractive additions. Even if I were to accept the appellant's argument that these extensions should (at least in part) define the character of the area, in my view this would only extend to places which are not visible, or at least not highly visible, from the public realm. The proposed rear extensions in this appeal would be in a prominent location within the streetscene, so I consider that the examples cited do not lend weight in support of this particular proposal.
10. No harm has been suggested by the Council in respect of the proposed front rooflights. On the basis of the evidence before me, including my observations on my site visit, I see no reason to disagree. However, a lack of harm in this respect would not outweigh the other harm I have found. Finally, the appellant has pointed out that the proposed development as a whole would "normally be allowed under permitted development". That may be so but, as the appellant also commented, such rights do not apply to flats and this consideration therefore carries limited weight in favour of this proposal. Again, it does not justify the harm which I have found.

11. I conclude that the proposed development would, because of the scale and bulk of the rear extensions, be harmful to the character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy SP11 of the 2017 Haringey Local Plan, and with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the 2017 Development Management Development Plan Document, which together seek to ensure that new development is designed to a high standard which respects local context and character, and that residential extensions and alterations complement the form, characteristics and detailing of the existing building.

Conclusion

12. The extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, and the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, the appeal is therefore dismissed.

M Cryan

Inspector