



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2022

by Martin Allen BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 April 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3288077

14 Gordon Road, Wood Green, London N11 2PD

- 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 February Properties Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/1342, dated 19 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a proposed loft conversion and dormer to first floor flats (Flat C and Flat D).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The scheme proposes the erection of two-flat roofed elements to the rear of the existing property; one a dormer to the main roof as well as an addition above the rear projecting wing.
4. The addition above the rear wing would extend upwards above the existing roof line and would result in the construction of a box-like roof extension. It would significantly increase the bulk of this rear element and would appear as an unsympathetic and crude addition to the property. Furthermore, given the increase in height over the rear wing, the scheme would have a disjointed appearance that fails to integrate acceptably with the existing building. While not visible from the road to the front, there are views from a nearby side street and in these views the proposal would be a highly discordant and incongruous addition to the property, that is visually intrusive.
5. The proposed dormer addition to the rear roof plane would be a subordinate addition and one that is comparable to other nearby similar extensions. Thus, this element of the scheme is not objectionable. This does not however overcome the harm I identify in respect of the extension above the rear wing.
6. Accordingly, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Thus, the scheme conflicts with policy DM1 of Haringey's Development Management Development Plan Document (2017), policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies (2013) and

policy D4 of the London Plan. Together, and amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development is of a high design quality.

Other Matters

7. I acknowledge that no objections were received from interested parties, that no objection is raised in terms of loss of light to surrounding properties and that there would be benefits in terms of an improved quality of internal accommodation for occupiers. However, these matters are not sufficient to outweigh the harm I identify.
8. I have had regard to the examples of other developments cited by the appellant. However, each of these differs from that which is before me, in terms of positioning, scale and detailed design. As such, none are directly comparable, and they have little bearing on my decision.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR