



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 November 2021

by Andrew Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3272782

Flat B, 5 Vale Grove, Tottenham, London N4 1PY

- 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 Richard Parker against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/2570, dated 1 October 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as new rear dormer to existing loft, construction of new dormer extension to outrigger, and installation of 2 no. rooflights to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. Since the determination of the application that is now the subject of this appeal, the London Plan 2021 was published in March 2021. The main parties to this appeal have had opportunities to comment upon any relevance of this to the outcome of the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposed rear dormer and extension to rear outrigger upon the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property has been converted into flatted accommodation and makes up part of a short linear residential terrace (the terrace) that is of traditional form and appearance. There is a high degree of uniformity to the terrace, with hipped roof elements in place to either side and outriggers set out routinely to the rear. Furthermore, its roof slopes, most particularly to the rear, tend to be clear of built additions. Notwithstanding the nearby presence of commercial uses, residential terraces of similar age and consistent makeup typify much of the site's surrounding area. Thus, a formal character and appearance is locally identifiable.
5. The proposed dormer and extension above the appeal property's rear outrigger, when considered in combination, would be read and experienced as bulky and disproportionately large additions. Indeed, the dormer considered in isolation would cover close to the entirety of the appeal property's rear roof slope. Whilst to be positioned relatively discreetly to the terrace's rear and thus set away from Vale Grove, the intended additions would be readily visible

to a range of local occupiers and would appear as excessively prominent and as at odds with the terrace's uncomplicated roofscape.

6. My attention has been drawn to numerous existing roof dormers close by. In some instances, these sit immediately alongside additions to rear outriggers. I have also noted references to other modern developments not served by traditional pitched roofs located nearby. Many of the various examples referred to relate to properties that front Hermitage Road. I acknowledge that these features offer variety and add some inconsistencies to the built environment. Nevertheless, in broad terms, a formal character and appearance remains readily identifiable local to the site. Moreover, of greatest relevance here is the existing regular composition of the terrace and its typically consistent roof slopes and outrigger designs.
7. For the above reasons, the proposed rear dormer and extension to rear outrigger would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. The scheme conflicts with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (adopted March 2013, altered 2017), Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document (July 2017) and Policies D1, D4 and D8 of the London Plan 2021 in so far as these policies set out that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, will be required to be of high, site specific, and sensitive design quality.

Other Matters

8. I have noted objections/concerns raised by interested parties with respect to matters including the construction phase of the development and the effect of the scheme upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, as I have found the proposal to be unacceptable for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to explore these matters further here.
9. The scheme would provide improvements to the local housing stock. Nevertheless, owing to the scale of development being considered, any associated benefits would attract limited weight insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified. The proposal conflicts with the development plan when read as a whole, and material considerations do not lead me to a decision otherwise.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Smith

INSPECTOR