

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 April 2022 by A Humphries BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/21/3285757

59 Ferme Park Road, Hornsey, London, N8 9RY

- 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 & Mrs A Hunt against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/1827, dated 18 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2021.
 - The development is for the provision of a balcony roof terrace with railings and side screening.
-

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.

Preliminary Matter

3. A roof terrace with steel balustrade railings has already been constructed to the rear of a dormer on the flat roofed outrigger of the host dwelling. It is clear from the plans and accompanying details that the existing balustrade railings to either side of the roof terrace would be replaced with wooden cladding. These cladding panels would provide side screening and be of greater height than the balustrade railings already constructed.
4. I have therefore considered the appeal based on the implemented roof terrace, together with the proposed side cladding panels, as shown on the submitted plans (the proposed development).

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area, including the setting of the Stroud Green Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. The host dwelling is a detached period property with a rear dormer and a two-storey flat roofed outrigger. Situated in a short row of semi-detached dwellings, a narrow gap separates the detached host dwelling from the neighbouring

- dwellings. The flat roofed outrigger of the host dwelling is characteristic of the outriggers immediately to the north.
7. The southern boundary of the host dwelling and its curtilage forms the edge of the Stroud Green Conservation Area (the Conservation Area) and thus is within the setting of the Conservation Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.
 8. In the absence of a Conservation Area Appraisal, I observed the significance of the Conservation Area to be derived from the intact red brick fronted two and three-storey Victorian dwellings with outriggers that sit within pairs or short terraces. The character and appearance are defined by a rhythm and architectural detailing to the front elevations, along with distinctive roofscape with dormers, steep sided roof slopes and turrets.
 9. The proposed development would see the side balustrade railings of the roof terrace replaced with wooden cladding that would extend to a greater height than the existing railings. This would protrude from a large roof dormer and would be significantly higher than the roof line of the outriggers of neighbouring dwellings. Owing to the height and cladding material of the side panels, the proposed development would be heavy in appearance, which as a result, would add considerably to the proportions and massing of the host dwelling. This would be incongruous with the flat roofed outriggers immediately north of the host dwelling and with the distinctive character and appearance of the area, albeit I am not persuaded that in itself, it would harm the significance of the heritage asset. In the context of the host dwelling and, in comparison, to the neighbouring dwellings, the proposed development would appear as a prominent and visually discordant feature above the roof line of neighbouring outriggers.
 10. I recognise that the proposed development would not be readily visible from the public domain. However, by virtue of the siting, height and material of the side cladding panels and the close built form of the neighbouring dwellings, the proposed development would be a prominent feature when viewed from adjacent properties. Given that the massing and material of the cladding panels in the context of the host dwelling would be uncharacteristic of the neighbouring dwellings, I consider that the proposed development would have a harmful visual effect on the immediate neighbouring views.
 11. During the site visit, I observed that roof terraces are a relatively uncommon feature in the immediate locality and thus do not form part of the prevailing character. However, the appellants have drawn my attention to some nearby roof terraces. Notwithstanding the lack of information before me regarding the extent to which the existing nearby roof terraces benefit from planning permission, I have taken them into account.
 12. From the evidence before me and observations from my site visit, I note that the nearby roof terraces vary in siting, design quality and appearance. Most existing roof terraces are characterised by balustrade railings and are translucent, although two roof terraces with fully encased solid screening panels were observed. These are not considered to be typical of the prevailing character of roof terraces and are also geographically separated from the Conservation Area by intervening built form. Owing to the different design

quality and appearance, along with a different relationship with neighbouring properties compared to the context of the host dwelling, these roof terraces are not deemed to be directly comparable to the proposed development. For this reason, I do not see the proposed development as representing the same circumstances as the other cited examples.

13. For the reasons above, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would not make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. However, I am satisfied that given the definition of significance of the heritage asset, there would not be an adverse effect on the setting of the Conservation Area as a consequence of the proposed development.
14. The proposed development would be contrary to policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021), policies SP0, SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management DPD (2017). Collectively, these policies seek high quality sensitive design that complements the distinctive character of the area in terms of form, scale and massing. The policies also seek the preservation or enhancement of the significance of heritage assets and their setting.
15. It is noted that the Council suggested that the proposed development would be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan. However, as this policy relates to housing standards and living conditions, it is not considered pertinent to the main issue addressed within this decision. I have therefore not taken into account this policy.

Other Matters

16. I sympathise with the private circumstances of the appellants and the benefits that the proposed development would provide. However, these do not outweigh the harm which I have identified to the character and appearance of the dwelling and area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. I have concluded that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. The development would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
18. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A Humphries

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR