



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 August 2022

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 September 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3295166

71 Connaught Gardens, Hornsey, London N10 3LG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Ms Rachel Carrell against London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/0119, is dated 10 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is a first floor side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor side extension at 71 Connaught Gardens, Hornsey, London N10 3LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2022/0119, dated 10 December 2021, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1824-00; 1824-01; 1824-02; 1824-03; 1824-04; 1824-05; 1824-06; 1824-07; 1824-08; 1824-09; 1824-10; and 1824-11.
 - 3) The external materials to be used for the proposed development shall match in colour, size, shape and texture those of the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have been provided with a refusal notice dated 17 June 2022, but this post-dates the lodging of the appeal. Therefore, I have determined this appeal based on the Council's failure to determine the planning application within the statutory timescale. I have, however, had regard to the Council's refusal notice as it provides clarity as to the reasons why the Council would have refused planning permission had it been able to do so.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area.

Reasons

4. Whilst there is some variation to the design of properties on Connaught Gardens, the predominant character comprises two-storey, semi-detached, hipped roof dwellings of a broadly similar design to that of the appeal property. This leads to a pleasing consistency to the street scene.

5. The design of the proposed extension would, largely, match that of the existing house with the proposed front, gable feature with timber and herringbone brick infill reflecting the appearance of the main front gable. The proposal would be set back from the front wall of the main front gable and would have a significantly lower roofline than the main roof of the dwelling. Notwithstanding the asymmetry of the gable feature and its off-centre position, the design and appearance of the proposal would respect that of the host dwelling.
6. The proposal would be a little more than half the width of the front elevation and comparable in width to the main front gable. It would sit forward of the front wall of the secondary front gable of the existing dwelling. Nonetheless, the lower roofline of the proposal and its setback from the main front gable would ensure that the proposal would appear subservient to the main dwelling.
7. The appeal site is at a lower level than 69 Connaught Gardens assisting in the assimilation of the proposal into the street scene in views travelling towards the junction of Connaught Gardens with Cranley Gardens by reducing its visual prominence. The bend in the road ensures that the proposal would not be unduly prominent when travelling in the other direction even though it would have a more elevated position in such views. In this context the addition of a first-floor extension would be acceptable despite the increase in visibility that would ensue, particularly when it is noted that the existing single storey extension already has a degree of prominence.
8. The proposal would extend to a position close to the side boundary with No 69, forward of its front elevation. However, the existing side extension already does so. As I have found that the proposal is not unduly prominent this is not unacceptable or harmful. Many properties on this side of Connaught Gardens are similarly close together, albeit within a consistent building line and not on a curve in the road. The proposal would not, therefore, appear as a discordant feature or unduly cramped.
9. For the reasons set out above, the proposal would not appear unduly dominant or harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling or the area. Accordingly, I find no conflict with 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, Development Plan Document 2017 which seek to ensure satisfactory design.

Conditions

10. I have considered it necessary to attach conditions relating to the materials to be employed in construction to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the proposed development. In the interests of certainty, I have also attached conditions specifying the approved plans.
11. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all relevant material considerations, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR