



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2022

by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 4th February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/21/3284220

7 Tower Terrace, Wood Green, London N22 6SX

- 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 Ms Natalie Shapanis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/1498, dated 17 May 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 July 2021.
 - The development proposed is: Single storey side/rear infill extension. Loft conversion with rear dormer and two front skylights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed loft conversion with rear dormer and two front skylights. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the single storey side/rear infill extension and planning permission is granted for a single storey side/rear infill extension at 7 Tower Terrace, Wood Green, London N22 6SX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2021/1498, dated 17 May 2021, and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: TT-1904-PGFLTVSSFERE and TT-2304-PBP except in respect of the loft conversion, rear dormer and front rooflights shown on the plans which do not form part of the development for which permission is granted.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the single storey side/rear infill extension hereby permitted shall be constructed in external facing materials which match the external materials used in the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. There is a discrepancy in the submitted plans in terms of the proposed alterations to the front of the dwelling. The 'Proposed Front Elevation' depicts the pitched roof of the two-storey bay being removed and replaced with a flat roof. However, the pitched roof is shown to be retained on the sectional drawings and roof plan. Given that there is no reference to removing that part of the roof in the description of development it seems likely that the failure to

depict it within the proposed front elevation is an error. Consequently, I have proceeded on the basis that the pitched roof would remain in situ, as shown on the sectional drawings and roof plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the dwelling, the area and the Wood Green Common Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of an attractive terrace which sits within the Wood Green Common Conservation Area (CA). The terrace fronts onto an area of greenspace and makes a positive contribution to the area on account of the detailed design which includes distinctive semi-hexagonal two storey bays, with associated steeply pitched roofs, finials, prominent chimney stacks and a largely unaltered roofscape. Whilst the green area immediately to the front is only a small pocket of land it has a clear visual connection to the parkland beyond which is an integral part of the CA and includes remnants of surviving common land, some of which are now laid out more formally as public gardens. That former common land and the attractive Victorian terraces surrounding it, form the essential character of the CA.
5. The CA boundary is drawn around the rear garden of the terrace and beyond that along Parkland Road the character is mixed, including some Victorian/Edwardian housing alongside twentieth century flats, commercial and retail development. Nonetheless, the rear of the terrace is prominent and makes a positive contribution in views into the CA on account of the original two-storey outriggers, balanced fenestration and largely unaltered roofline which contains distinctive 'fire break' parapets running down from the main ridgeline, across the top of the outriggers, terminating at eaves level with projecting decorative coursing.
6. The proposed dormer would pay no regard to the original roof form in terms of its scale and box-like proportions which would fail to reflect the pitched roof profile of the dwelling. It would extend across the full width, up to the fire-break walls at each side and from the eaves up to the ridge. Little of the original roof form would remain visible. Thus, the design and scale would be harmful of itself. The bulky addition would also erode the consistent roof form of the wider terrace which rises up gently to take account of the natural contour of the land and would disrupt the pleasing visual effect of the distinctive fire-breaks walls. Overall, it would be an overtly modern addition that would cause significant harm to the character of the terrace in a prominent position at the gateway to the CA.
7. As noted above, the front elevation of the property makes a positive impact within the wider area in its design and prominent relationship with surrounding open space. The conical style pitched roofs above the bay windows are particularly distinctive. The two front rooflights would be set high in the roof such that they would be highly visible. Whilst small of themselves, they would disrupt the hitherto unaltered rhythm of the roof of the wider terrace and add clutter to the roofscape, thereby causing harm to the character and appearance of the terrace and wider CA.

8. In contrast, the ground floor addition to the side of the rear outrigger would not be prominent in views from outside the site, being largely obscured at street level by surrounding fencing and planting. Moreover, it would replace an existing side addition which is somewhat dilapidated and make-shift in appearance. Due to the glazed roof the small addition would have a light-weight appearance and would not unduly impair the ability to view the original form of the two-storey outrigger, nor would it disrupt the rhythm of the terrace as a whole due to its discreet position, tucked within the reveal. It would be a sensitively designed minor addition that would not cause harm to the building or the character and appearance of the CA.
9. In view of the above, the proposed dormer window and front rooflights would be contrary to the design and conservation related aims of policies SP11 and 12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) (the LP), policies DM1 and DM9 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document (2017) and policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021). Those aspects of the scheme would also contravene the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) with respect of good design, particularly paragraph 130, in terms of the need for good design.
10. The harm to the character and appearance of the CA would be localised and not substantial in the context of the asset as a whole. Nonetheless, any harm to a CA is a matter that attracts significant weight. Having regard to paragraph 202 of the Framework there are no public benefits that would outweigh the harm or justify the proposal which is in clear conflict with the policies of the development plan. Accordingly, planning permission should not be granted for that element of the scheme.
11. However, the ground floor addition would comply with the aims of the relevant policies referred to above and would preserve the wider character and appearance of the CA. That element is clearly severable from the proposed roof alterations and in the absence of any harm or policy conflict, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed and permission granted for that part of the scheme.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard condition relating to the commencement of work, a condition is necessary to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans, insofar as relates to the approved element, in the interests of clarity and precision. In order to ensure that the development preserves the character and appearance of the area a further condition is necessary to ensure that the materials used match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal in relation to the roof alterations, dormer window and front rooflights should be dismissed due to the harm to the character and appearance of the building and the CA and conflict with the development plan. However, no harm would arise from the ground floor extension and that part of the scheme would comply with relevant policies of the development plan and should be allowed. Accordingly, I shall allow the appeal in part, subject to the conditions set out above, and dismiss the appeal insofar as it relates to the loft conversion with rear dormer and front rooflights.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR