



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 July 2022

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3293231

458A West Green Road, Tottenham, London N15 3PT

- 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 Gunac Yaman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/3205, dated 19 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of an additional floor on top of the first floor rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant's Statement of Case makes reference to the 2019 and 2021 versions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). I have determined the appeal on the policy in place at the time of the decision, which in the case of the Framework is the 2021 version.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - the effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of 456 West Green Road, with regard to daylight/sunlight and outlook.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. West Green Road is a row of three storey terraced properties with commercial uses at the ground floor and residential on the upper floors. To the rear, there is a three storey, flat roofed projection at 456 West Green Road. There are also varying heights and massing to the existing outriggers and their extensions. However, No. 456 is a clear exception, and it was evident from my site visit that there is otherwise a general symmetry and harmonious character, created by the sloped roofscape of the original properties and their mainly two storey rear extensions. No. 434 also has a three storey rear extension. However, it is not readily seen in context with the appeal site, such that it does not inform the immediate character of the area.

5. The proposal is for an additional floor onto an existing outrigger. The appellant contends that the flat roof will soften the design. However, given the dominant sloped roofscape of the original properties and surrounding two storey extensions, the introduction of a flat roof in an otherwise harmonious sloped roofscape would be an incongruous boxy addition. Moreover, due to the existing sloping roofs, a flat roof in this location would appear bulky and would not relate positively to the character and appearance of the area. In this regard, the proposal does not secure high quality design which takes account of local character and surrounding built environment, as sought by the Framework (2021).
6. For the above reasons, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is in conflict with Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) (Local Plan) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD) (2017). These policies include a requirement for housing to be of a high quality design and development that responds to a site's context, character and capacity for growth and makes a positive contribution to a place, improving the character and quality of an area.

Living Conditions

7. The existing two storey extension at No. 456 and ground floor extension at the appeal site results in a relatively narrow gap between the properties. The introduction of an additional floor on top of the existing ground floor extension would create an enclosing effect, to the detriment of the outlook and daylight/sunlight levels experienced by the occupiers of No. 456. While it may be that extensions to terraced properties are often constrained by their context, the proposal would further increase the height and have a greater impact.
8. Consequently, the proposal would cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of 456 West Green Road, with regard to outlook and daylight/sunlight, in conflict with Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017). These policies, amongst other things, require housing to be of a high quality design and development to have a high standard of amenity for its users.

Other Matters

9. It may well be that the proposal would help to relieve overcrowding and provide accommodation for larger families in a highly accessible location. However, it has not been shown that there is a particular problem that needs to be resolved at this specific site, so I attribute these general benefits limited weight.

Conclusion

10. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR