



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 May 2022

by Thomas Hatfield BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date:

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3288472

2E Townsend Road, Tottenham, London, N15 4NT

- 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 Chaim Josefovitz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/2833, dated 14 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of an additional floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the development, firstly, on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to outlook and light, and secondly, on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

Living conditions

3. The appeal building is a relatively squat structure that has a single storey appearance when viewed from the road. It is located in close proximity to the side elevation of a block of flats at No 168 Pages Green Terrace, which has habitable room windows facing the boundary.
4. The development would raise the height of the existing building by an additional storey. This would introduce a high flank wall approximately 3 metres from apartment windows in No 168. This arrangement would largely remove the outlook from a 2nd floor window, which currently has open views to the east. Whilst it is asserted that this room is dual aspect, that does not justify enclosing an existing habitable room window at close quarters, as is proposed here. In my view, this would have a harmful overbearing effect that would be visually oppressive to the occupiers of that property.
5. The existing building was granted permission in 2012 (Ref HGY/2012/0015) and is around 3 metres from other windows in No 168 Pages Green Terrace. However, the full details of that approval, including the form and height of the development it replaced, are not before me. In any case, this existing

arrangement does not justify the introduction of additional built form that would create an unacceptable sense of enclosure along the boundary.

6. Separately, the proposed rear-facing windows would be obscurely glazed, fixed shut, and set back from the rear elevation of the property. This would ensure that gardens to the rear of the development would retain adequate levels of privacy. Whilst the extension would be in close proximity to a window in No 2C, that is obscurely glazed and does not serve a habitable room. Accordingly, no unacceptable loss of light or outlook would occur. However, these considerations do not alter my other concerns regarding the development.
7. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to outlook. It would therefore be contrary to Policy 6 of the London Plan (2021), and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new development provides a high standard of amenity for neighbouring occupiers.

Character and appearance

8. The appeal property is a single storey structure located on the southern side of Townsend Road. Taller buildings are positioned on either side, and the development would raise the building's height to broadly align with the adjoining property to the east. In isolation, its front elevation would be broadly in keeping with the street. However, its side profile would have an awkward disjointed appearance that would fail to harmonise with the existing building. In this regard, the vertical extension would have a narrow squarish appearance from the side, that would appear visually jarring in views from the northwest. Whilst such views would be partially obscured by a street tree when in leaf, this would only provide screening for part of the year. In my view, this element of the scheme would have a discordant appearance within the street.
9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017). These policies seek to ensure, amongst other things, that new housing development is of high quality design, respects its local context, and relates positively to neighbouring structures.

Conclusion

10. As set out above, I conclude that the development would significantly harm the character and appearance of the area and the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to outlook. Whilst it would create a family sized unit of accommodation, and would generate some economic benefits, that does not alter my view that the appeal should be dismissed.

Thomas Hatfield

INSPECTOR