



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 07 December 2021 by Ms S Maur

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 July 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/21/3279468

Site Address: 10 Terrick Road, Wood Green, London N22 7SH

- 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 Ahmed Mohamed Khan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/1337, dated 24 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 21 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is a retrospective application for a loft conversion with rear dormer.
-

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 main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Procedural Matters

4. The original planning application was made retrospectively. It is noted that the Council raises a number of concerns as to whether the drawings are a full representation of what has been constructed. The appeal must be considered on the basis of the submitted drawings of the scheme (referred to as 'existing' in this case).

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a Victorian semi-detached two-storey dwelling located within a residential setting. A stepped gable wall is an architectural feature of this area and is visible on a number of nearby pairs of dwellings on this road. The host dwelling is a part of three pairs of semi-detached dwellings with similar architectural features. Most of the side elevations of the pairs of dwellings with stepped gable walls, including the host dwellings, are constructed of London Stock Brick. They also largely have unaltered roofscapes. There is a modest gap between the pairs of properties which gives views of the side elevation and gable walls of the properties, when travelling

- down Terrick Road. The appeal dwelling is highly visible from a gap in the street scene on Dorset Road and from neighbouring dwellings.
6. The proposal consists of a loft conversion with a large rear dormer that covers the full width of the rear elevation. The proposed rear dormer has a minimal stepdown from the ridge line. This would create a top heavy and unbalanced appearance when viewed next to the neighbouring properties of similar architectural style which do not have rear dormers.
 7. Although there is an existing two-storey outrigger and extension on the rear elevation, the rear dormer would still dominate the rear of the host dwelling due to the height and absence of a set in from the sides of the roof. The alteration is at roof level and there is a modest separation distance between the host dwelling and the neighbouring dwelling, however, the proposal would still be visible from Terrick Road and Dorset Road. The length of the rear garden of the host property and the dwellings on Dorset Road would not prohibit views from Dorset Road and several neighbouring gardens. Conditions to address the current materials used would not overcome these harmful impacts.
 8. As outlined in The London Borough of Haringey Conservation Area Character Appraisal, there are some unsympathetic alterations to this group of properties. However, given that the roof form of these properties are largely unaltered, the proposed dormer roof would result in harm to the significance of this part of the Conservation Area that would not be minimised by the existing alterations. Addressing any structural stability issues with the existing gable wall did not necessitate the appeal development in its current form and so this matter does not justify the scheme. General reference has been made to examples of other developments. However, full details have not been provided and, in any event, each case must be considered on its own merits.
 9. It has been suggested that a dormer window may constitute permitted development. However, no evidence has been submitted to substantiate this, and the rights referred to under class B, relating to additions to the roof of a dwelling house, do not extend to dwellings within a conservation area.
 10. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation area. The National Planning Policy Framework also requires that great weight be given to the Conservation of designated heritage assets.
 11. Due to the scale of the development and that it would only be seen from a small part of the Conservation Area, the proposal would cause less than substantial harm. However, no substantive public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.
 12. For the reasons outlined above, the development would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the Conservation Area. This would be contrary to Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) which together seek high design quality and that heritage assets are protected. The proposal would also conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which states that development proposals affecting heritage assets, and their settings, should conserve their significance,

by being sympathetic to the assets' significance and appreciation within their surroundings.

13. Although Policy SP7 of Haringey's Local Plan, Strategic Policies (2017) and Policy D6 of The London Plan (2021) have been referred to, their focus is on transport and housing quality and space standards particularly in relation to internal living space, which are not directly relevant to this appeal. However, any lack of direct conflict with these policies does not minimise or outweigh the conflict with the policies identified above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Ms S Maur

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

K Taylor

INSPECTOR