



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021 by C Glaister BSc (Hons)

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/21/3280766

281 The Roundway, Tottenham, London N17 7AJ

- 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 T Islam against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/1600, dated 14 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 5 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side/rear extension & single-storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The Government published a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 20 July 2021. Regard has been had to the revised national policy as a material consideration in the decision-making process. However, in this instance, the issues most relevant to the appeal remain unaffected by the revisions to the Framework. There is therefore no requirement to seek further submissions on the revised Framework.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on:
 - the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and of the surrounding area; and
 - the living conditions of the neighbouring residents at 279 and 283 The Roundway, with regard to outlook and whether or not it would be overbearing or create a sense of enclosure.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

5. The site is an end-of-terrace two-storey dwelling with a hipped roof. There have been alterations to two of the porches further east, and there is a ground-floor side extension at the other end of the terrace. These elements are clearly

subservient to the terrace as a whole, and do not significantly affect its core appearance. It is located within a residential area and there are many similar terraces in the vicinity. There is a significant distance present at both sides of the boundary between 279 and 281 The Roundway.

6. The largely symmetrical appearance of the terrace, and those around it, forms part of the character of the area. Given its height and width, the side extension would constitute a substantial addition to the property, and create an imbalance in the terrace as a whole. It would appear incongruous amongst the terraces nearby, which remain balanced, and cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. The set back at first-floor level and the lowered ridge height would not sufficiently mitigate the harm.
7. The development at 224 The Roundway is further from the road and partly obscured by another building, which lessens its effect on the character and appearance of the area. The appeal is considered with regard to its own individual merits. The development at No 224 would not mitigate the harm that would arise. The development at 227 The Roundway is similar in design to the development at the other end of that terrace, and the terrace as a whole remains balanced. It would not therefore justify the harm that would arise from the proposal.
8. For these reasons, the development would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore fail to comply with Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026 (March 2013) (LPSP) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (July 2017) (DPD) where they together seek to ensure development respects its local context, contributes to the distinctive character of the area, and complements the form of the original building. Policy D4 of the London Plan is strategic in nature dealing with the design and review process, it is not directly relevant to the appeal scheme. However, the development would nevertheless conflict with its overarching objective to ensure the delivery of good design.

Living Conditions

9. Due to the large amount of space between Nos 279 and 281, and the space which would remain, no harm would arise to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 279 with regard to outlook, overbearing, or enclosure. Due to the position of the development on the western side of the property, the depth of the rear elements, and the space which would remain between the two-storey element of the development at the rear and 283 The Roundway, the living conditions of the occupiers of No 283 would not be compromised and harm would not arise.
10. For these reasons, the development would not harm the living conditions of the neighbouring residents at 279 and 283 The Roundway, with regard to outlook, overbearing, or enclosure. It would therefore comply with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the DPD in so far as they relate to living conditions by ensuring appropriate amenity for neighbours. Policy SP11 of the LPSP is not directly relevant to living conditions.

Other Matters

11. Whether or not the rear ground-floor element of the development would constitute permitted development in isolation, this would not fundamentally

alter the conclusions reached in this recommendation. It is not clearly severable from the rest of the development and therefore cannot be considered independently from the proposal as a whole when issuing a decision.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. Although no harm has been found in respect of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers this would not mitigate or outweigh the harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the area. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Glaister

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR