



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 November 2021

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3275914

2 Park Avenue, Wood Green, London N22 7EX

- 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 John Wray against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2020/2418, dated 7 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 27 November 2020.
 - The development proposed comprises the demolition of outbuilding, erection of single storey side extension, erection of part single storey, part first floor rear extension, raising of roof with creation of crown roof, insertion of front and rear dormer, insertion of 8 rooflights, alterations to front garden including installation of bin store, front boundary wall with soft and hard landscaping, installation of rear cycle storage, in association with conversion of property into five self-contained flats.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. During the course of the appeal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (the Framework) was published. I consider that there have been no fundamental changes relevant to the main issue in this appeal and therefore no party will be prejudiced by my consideration of it.
3. Although policies from the 2016 London Plan were given in the reason for refusal, the Council has supplied Policies D6 and HC1 from the 2021 updated version of the London Plan (LP). I note the updated LP was published some time before the submission of the appeal and as such, I am satisfied both parties have had the opportunity to consider this in the context of the proposal.
4. The description in the banner heading above is taken from the decision notice rather than the planning application form as a number of amendments were made to the proposal prior to the refusal of planning permission. Therefore, the amended description above more accurately describes the proposal. I note the appellant has used this description in their appeal form and as such it does not appear to be in dispute.
5. Amended plans were submitted with the appeal which sought to reconfigure the internal arrangements of rooms to address issues regarding internal communal space, among others. I note the Council does not take issue with the amended plans being considered in the appeal and agree that the changes now

address the second reason for refusal given in the decision notice, which is no longer contested.

Main Issue

6. Given the above, the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and street scene, as well as the Trinity Gardens Conservation Area (TGCA).

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises a double fronted, two-storey detached property with a hipped roof, projecting front two-storey bay extension and an outrigger extension to the rear. The proposal seeks a number of alterations to the host building to facilitate a conversion to five self-contained flats, although it is the rear extension, front dormer and the raising and partial crowning of the roof which are emphasised as harmful by the Council. These elements therefore form the basis of my assessment.
8. The host building and a similar detached property at No.24 have lower ridge heights than the semi-detached properties between and lack front dormer windows. As such, these appear to 'book end' the intervening properties, all of which include a front dormer and crowned roofs. This 'hierarchy' of buildings adds a pleasant rhythm and conformity to the character of Park Avenue.
9. The proposal to add a front dormer, raise the ridge and alter the roof form would erode this cohesion in the street scene, removing the shared characteristics of the appeal building and No.24 and therefore part of this hierarchal character which is a positive contributor to the street scene. Although I understand the appellant has sought to draw inspiration from the intervening properties with regards to the design of the dormer window, ridge height and roof form, the design of the appeal property and No.24 were clearly designed in this manner to differentiate from the dwellings between rather than fall in line. While No's 2 and 24 may not be in the same 'cone of vision', the alteration of these original features would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the contribution it makes to the street scene.
10. Inevitably, some alterations have taken place to individual properties on Park Avenue, although that does not justify allowing further changes which would constitute harm. In fact, this places more of an emphasis on preserving these important features which contribute positively to the character and appearance of the area.
11. The rear extension would cover the whole width of the rear elevation of the host building while also extending to a similar height as the existing extension. This would add considerable mass and bulk to the rear of the host building which has already been extended. The sense of scale and mass would be further compounded by the joining of the existing side extension to the proposed rear extension. Although I would agree it would not be prominent from the public realm to the front, it would be visible from other residences to the rear and from vantage points to the northern end of Park Avenue. I appreciate the layout of fenestration of the existing rear extension does not currently align with that of the host building, although the added consistency of the proposal with its fenestration would not overcome the harm I have identified.

12. I understand planning permission was granted¹ for a rear extension at the appeal site in 2009, which was not implemented. Although the appellant considers the proposal before me to be of better design than that previously approved, this does not justify the harm I have identified in and of itself. Moreover, the previous approval was some time ago and predates both the development plan and the Framework.
13. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The Framework sets out at paragraph 193 that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to that asset's conservation.
14. The significance of the TGCA is derived from the openness provided by linked landscaped green spaces contrasted by residential streets to the east of Crescent Gardens, which are narrower and of higher density, of domestic scale and a more enclosed nature. Park Avenue is highlighted in the Conservation Area Appraisal (CAA) as a largely complete Victorian street of high-quality well-designed houses with little loss and no major alterations that is an area of architectural quality and historic relevance that make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
15. Given the important contribution the Victorian architecture makes to the significance of the TGCA, the harm I have identified to the host building and the street scene would in turn be harmful to the TGCA. The harm that would arise would be localised and therefore, in terms of the approach in the Framework, this would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. I have not been presented with any public benefits which would arise from the proposal and therefore have nothing to balance the harm I have identified.
16. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and street scene. It would also fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the TGCA. Accordingly, the proposed development would conflict with Policies DM1 and DM9 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (adopted July 2017), SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 - 2026 (adopted March 2013) and HC1 of the LP. These state, among other things, that development proposals should relate positively to their locality, having regard to building heights, form, scale and massing prevailing around the site. Furthermore, development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings. The proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 193 of the Framework, which advises great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.

¹ HGY/2009/0061

Other Matters

17. I acknowledge the appellant's concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, these matters do not alter my findings above in which I have had regard to the planning merits of the proposals. I agree that consistency in decision-making is important. However, it is incumbent on me to assess the proposal on its own merits. Despite other examples being referenced, such as extensions to properties on Selbourne Road and Clarence Road, I have little information on these. As such I cannot be certain of any relevance to the proposal before me.

Conclusion

18. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building, street scene and the TGCA. This harm would not be overcome by public benefits. As such it would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR