
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2022 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by Chris Preston BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 February 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/21/3286470

4 Hastings Terrace, Conway Road, London, N15 3BE

- 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 Tony Carr-de La May against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/2089, dated 22 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 17 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is: Erection of metal gates and railings to front garden.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. No. 4 is a two-storey end of terraced property with its front garden featuring an area of hardstanding enabling off street parking. It is bound to one side by a tall, rendered wall, metal gates and railings to the front and the other side that is shared with No. 3.
5. The majority of neighbouring properties have low-lying solid front boundary treatments with variations in both design and materials. Despite the variations there appears to be a degree of consistency in the heights, use of materials and their solid appearance; with brick and/or render appearing as the predominant material. This uniformity and regular pattern of development contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
6. Whilst other materials feature throughout the street, including metal and timber, as seen at No. 4 and atop of neighbouring boundary walls, the singular use of these in the construction of a boundary treatment appears limited. Where they are apparent, they visually detract from the positive contribution that the established solid low lying boundary treatments make to this part of Hastings Terrace.

7. The proposal would see the existing railings at No. 4 replaced with other metal railings of a different scale and design. The proposed height would result in them appearing prominent when viewed in comparison with the neighbouring low-lying front boundaries. Despite replacing the existing railings, as a result of the plain vertical design they would introduce a somewhat industrial appearance into this primarily residential street. Furthermore, the transparent nature of the railings would be at odds with the more traditional solid boundaries resulting in them appearing visually obtrusive and at odds within the area.
8. The appellant states the replacement railings would revive and refresh the area. However, whilst in isolation they would appear new and fresh, having regard to the above assessment and in the context of the wider street scape they would appear visually juxtaposed and harmful for the reasons stated above.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and as such does not accord with Policy DM1 of the Development Management, Development Plan Document (2017) and Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) which combined seek to achieve a high standard of design which contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the local area, and which enhances the built environment.

Conclusion

10. The proposal conflicts with the most relevant policies in an up-to-date development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

Chris Preston

INSPECTOR