



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by C Cresswell BSc (Hons) MA MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 29 October 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3274602

Garwoods Lodge, 421 High Road, Wood Green, London N22 8JU

- 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 Simon Breuer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/2641, dated 13 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 8 December 2020.
 - The development proposed is change of use of Land Adjacent to 421 High Road, erection of single storey A2 (Offices) building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. This part of High Road is relatively straight, with clear views up and down the road in both directions. Although it is a predominantly residential area, with houses and blocks of flats on both sides of the road, there are also commercial premises in the vicinity. This includes the Tesco Express supermarket next to the appeal site. While there are a mix of architectural styles in the street, there is a clearly defined building line behind which most built development is positioned. Due to the straightness of the road at this point, this building line is very evident in both directions when looking up and down the street.
4. The appeal site is an area of land which is situated between the side elevation of a block of flats and the pavement. Although it contains large advertising boards, these are situated on a grass verge and the site is otherwise open and clear of development. Hence the distinctive building line is maintained.
5. The proposed office building would be a modestly sized, single storey unit with a green, vegetated roof and glazed frontage. Architecturally, it would have the appearance of a small commercial unit compatible with the mixed styles in the area. Yet while it would be a small feature in the context of the wider street frontage, it would project forward of the established building line thereby disrupting a distinctive quality of the street. As such, the office would appear as a relatively prominent and discordant feature despite its modest size. The green roof, whilst softening the appearance, would not mitigate this.

6. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. There would be conflict with Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD¹ as well as Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan². Together, these policies aim for appropriate standards of design.

Other Matters

7. I am mindful that the overall purpose of planning is to achieve sustainable development and the proposed office could play a role in supporting economic objectives. However, limited evidence has been provided to indicate what the office may be used for or what specific role it could play in supporting the local economy. It is also somewhat unclear why it needs to be in this particular location. Therefore, based on the evidence provided, I am unable to determine that the harm I have identified in terms of character and appearance would be outweighed by economic benefits. This is not the sustainable development for which the Framework³ says that there is a presumption in favour.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

Colin Cresswell

INSPECTOR

¹ Haringey Development Management DPD, July 2017.

² Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013–2026.

³ National Planning Policy Framework, July 2021.