



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: 01 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/21/3278028

1 Mayfair Gardens, Tottenham, London N17 7LP

- 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 Loka against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/0361, dated 15 December 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 1 Mayfair Gardens, Tottenham, London N17 7LP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2021/0361, dated 15 December 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: GD2224/01, GD2224/02, GD2224/03, GD2224/04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with particular regard to outlook.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Most of the terraced housing within this part of Mayfair Gardens maintains a consistent appearance when viewed from the street frontage. This includes the frontage of the appeal property, which is at the end of the terrace towards the junction with Great Cambridge Road. However, due to the existing ground

floor and roof extensions, the rear profile of the dwelling has been changed substantially from its original design. As such, it maintains a somewhat bulkier appearance than some other end terrace properties in this area.

4. The proposed first floor extension would further alter the appearance of the property. As well as making the dwelling appear somewhat bulkier, it would also create a staggered profile, with the roof of the extension being below the ridge height of the main dwelling.
5. However, while the extension would further complicate the appearance of the property, it has already been altered to the extent that the original profile of the end terrace has been lost. Furthermore, due to its positioning at the rear of the property, the extension would not be a highly prominent feature within Mayfair Gardens or the wider surroundings. Although the extension would be seen in side views when approaching the property from the direction of Great Cambridge Road, it would be set back from the Mayfair Gardens frontage and would face a service lane containing garages. As such, it would not have a particularly substantial impact on the appearance of the street scene.
6. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan¹, Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD² or Policy D4 of the London Plan³. These policies seek to achieve appropriate standards of design.

Living conditions

7. Although the proposed extension would be inset from the boundary, it would nonetheless be close to some of the windows of No 3 Mayfair Gardens, the neighbouring dwelling. However, the windows closest to the extension are relatively small and do not form part of the main outlook from the rear of the neighbouring dwelling towards the garden. The larger ground floor patio doors and first floor bay window, which also face towards the garden, are situated further from the boundary and the extension would have a limited impact on the outlook from them. The second floor windows of the neighbouring dwelling are above the height of the proposed extension and its pitched roof would slope away from the boundary. Therefore, while the extension could be seen from these windows, an open aspect would be maintained.
8. The garden of the neighbouring property is relatively long and maintains an open outlook. It seems to me that the side elevation of the proposed extension would not diminish this outlook and, having a south facing aspect, natural light levels would remain high within the garden. Hence, the proposal would not lead to a sense of enclosure or appear unduly overbearing.
9. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on neighbouring occupiers. There would be no conflict with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan or Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD with regard to these matters.

¹ Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026.

² Haringey Development Management DPD, July 2017.

³ The London Plan, March 2021.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons, the appeal should be allowed.

11. In the interests of clarity, standard conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans and within a time limit have been imposed. To help protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition requiring matching materials.

C Cresswell

INSPECTOR