



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 9 May 2022

by Katherine Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 June 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3286383

128 Dowsett Road, Tottenham, London N17 9DH

- 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 Aron Bard on behalf of Grangefarm Estates Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/2798, dated 1 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of ground floor side extension and rear outbuilding and the erection of a two storey two bedroom house.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/Y5420/W/21/3286388

128 Dowsett Road, Tottenham, London N17 9DH

- 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 Aron Bard on behalf of Grangefarm Estates Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/2786, dated 1 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 28 October 2021.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of ground floor side extension and rear outbuilding and the erection of a two storey plus roof dormer two bedroom house.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out there are two appeals on this site. Both proposals involve the demolition of the existing single storey side extension and the construction of a two bedroomed house. Appeal B also involves the construction of a dormer as part of the new dwelling. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, as one of the main issues is the same and to avoid duplication, I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where indicated.
4. I note that the proposed side elevation in Appeal A appears not to have been drawn accurately in respect of the appearance of the hipped roof on the rear projection. I have taken account of this in the determination of the appeal.

Main Issues

5. For Appeal A the main issue is:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

6. For Appeal B the main issues are:

- the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and
- whether the proposed accommodation would provide adequate living accommodation for future occupiers with the regard to internal space provision.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

7. The appeal site is an end terrace property on Dowsett Road adjacent to a pedestrian walkway between the road and Carew Road. Dowsett Road and the surrounding streets are characterised by modest two storey terraced houses of generally consistent design. In this part of the street the houses have a single bay with a pitched roof over the front door, some of which have been infilled to create a porch. Properties in the road appear to generally be in single-family occupancy. The appeal property has been extended to the side and rear with a flat roofed single storey extension.
8. The single storey side extension and a large outbuilding in the garden would be demolished and replaced with an extension which would be occupied as a separate dwelling. It would be much narrower than the surrounding houses including the modern infill directly opposite at 117A Dowsett Road. The proposed dwelling would share a front door with 128 Dowsett Road and therefore would not be readily apparent as a separate dwelling. Consequently, the provision of a dwelling with a shared entrance would be at odds with the prevailing character of the street.
9. The proposal in Appeal A would project beyond the rear elevation of the host dwelling over two storeys. No other properties in this section of terrace have been extended at first floor level. Consequently, the terrace maintains a strong building line at first floor level. The proposal would be visible from both the rear of the properties in the road and Carew Road behind. It would also be highly visible from the walkway between the two roads. In that respect the proposal would not be in keeping with the appearance of the host terrace nor that of those surrounding it.
10. The inclusion of a full width dormer in Appeal B would not be set back from the eaves of the house and not set down from the ridge. This would serve to exacerbate the height and bulk of the overall extension which would not relate well to the host property.
11. I appreciate that there are a number of properties in proximity to the appeal site which have dormer extensions. I do not know the circumstances under which they were constructed or their status with regard to planning permission and therefore cannot draw any direct comparison with the proposal that would weigh in its favour. In any event, I must consider the appeal on its own merits and the presence of these does not overcome the harm that I have otherwise found.
12. For the reasons above, I conclude that both proposals would cause harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area contrary to Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) (DPD) and Policy

D3 of the London Plan (2021) (LP). It would also conflict with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (adopted 2013 with alterations 2017) (HLP). Amongst other things, these policies seek to ensure that new development achieves a high standard of design, and that it respects the local context and character.

Appeal B only

Internal Space Provision

13. The proposed dwelling would have two bedrooms. One of which would be in the roof space. LP Policy D6 sets out acceptable requirements for housing to be comfortable and functional. Internal space standards are set out in Table 3.1 as part of this policy. The table consciously excludes standards for 2-bed accommodation set over three floors.
14. The exclusion of 1 and 2-bed accommodation over three floors from the overall gross internal floor area standards set out in Table 3.1 suggests that this layout is not considered acceptable in order to provide accommodation which is considered to be functional and comfortable. I accept that the list in Table 3.1 is not a closed list. For example, it does not include 4 storey dwellings. Nevertheless, it specifically excludes 3 storey 1-bed and 2-bed accommodation, as well as 2 storey 1-bed accommodation, by identifying it as 'N/A'. The common interpretation of the abbreviation N/A is 'not applicable'. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that Table 3.1 does not include a minimum internal floor area for 1 and 2-bedroom accommodation over 3 floors because it is not applicable due to it being an unacceptable layout of residential accommodation.
15. The proposed dwelling would provide accommodation for 4 people and as such requires one double bedroom of at least 11.5m² which is at least 2.75m wide. All other double bedrooms must be at least 2.55m wide. Due to the awkward shape of the first-floor bedroom, it is not clear from the plans that a double bed could be comfortably accommodated within the space.
16. Furthermore, the layout of the living accommodation on the ground floor is not ideal in that the living room would also act as circulation space to access the kitchen. The plans do not indicate how furniture and circulation space might be accommodated on a practical level. Nevertheless, there are no standards relating to this in LP Policy D6. As such I find no conflict with the policy in this respect.
17. For the reasons given above, although I have found the proposal would not conflict with LP Policy D6 with regard to the living room accommodation, overall, I conclude that the proposed development would not provide adequate living conditions for future occupiers with regard to the layout and standards of the bedroom accommodation proposed. The proposal would therefore conflict with LP Policy D6 which, amongst other things, seeks to ensure that new development provides a good standard of accommodation for its occupiers. It would also conflict with DPD policies DM1 and DM12 which also seek to ensure high standards of living accommodation for future occupiers.

Conclusion and Planning Balance

18. The Council acknowledges that its delivery of housing over the last three years is substantially below its housing target and therefore Paragraph 11d of the Framework should be engaged. Paragraph 11d requires planning permission to be granted unless the adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework as a whole.
19. The proposals would only contribute a net addition of one dwelling to the supply of housing in the area. Given the number of dwellings proposal, the benefits of providing one house in providing accommodation where there is a shortfall would be limited.
20. I have found harm on the character and appearance of the site and its surroundings and in the case of Appeal B additionally on the living conditions of future occupants and that harm when taken together would be significant. With the above in mind, the adverse impacts of granting planning permission for the proposed development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh its benefits when assessed against policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, it would not represent sustainable development for which the presumption in favour applies.
21. For the reasons given above, neither proposal would accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate that the appeals should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

Katherine Robbie

INSPECTOR