
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2022

by C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3290904

71 Bruce Grove, Tottenham, London N17 6UZ

- 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 Wray (Redgrove Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/1382, dated 23 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Property is currently 3 self contained flats (ongoing works not completed) Application for material amendment to Planning Consent reference HGY/2018/2725, granted on 16/07/2020, seeking variation to flat 3 to incorporate a rear roof outrigger and enlarge to a 1 bed 2-person flat from granted 1-person flat'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, the extension was visible from Hartham Road and Forest Gardens and is therefore considered on a retrospective basis. I note this is not disputed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and local area, including the Bruce Grove Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a mid-terrace property with a shop at ground floor level and a rear outrigger extension with a pitched roof. An approved planning application¹ permitted the sub-division of the dwelling into two one-bed flats at first and second floor levels and a studio flat at roof level with a rear dormer.
5. The rear roofscape of the host terrace is largely unaltered, other than a dormer on the roof of No 84. The pitched roofs of the adjoining pairs of outriggers create a pleasing rhythm and uniformity when viewed from Forest Gardens, while their eaves and ridges are set beneath their host buildings to add subordination.

¹ HGY/2018/2725

6. The extension subject to this appeal projects out to nearly an equal depth as the outrigger, while the ridge is at a very similar height as the host building. Rather than being subtle, this adds substantial mass and bulk to the host roof which lacks subordination to the host building while making it appear top heavy. Despite the set-in from the side, the roof shape is incongruous due to the projection above the adjoining half of the outrigger which results in an awkward visual relationship and interrupts the rhythm and uniformity of the rear roofscape as a whole. Although it is claimed that the extension is not visible from the local area, I observed it clearly from Forest Gardens and partially from Hartham Road.
7. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out at paragraph 193 that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to that asset's conservation.
8. The appeal site lies in the Bruce Grove CA, which derives part of its significance from its Victorian era commercial townscapes and period architectural detailing and features. The Bruce Grove Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (MP) also divides the CA into sub areas, with the appeal site located within Bruce Grove and Moorefield Road section (D). The MP describes the No's 70-103 as having a relatively good survival of features such as consoles and cornices, and a few sash windows remain at upper-floor level, among other things. Map 15 also identifies the host terrace as a positive contributor to sub-area D.
9. Given the important contribution period detailing and Victorian era terraces make to the significance of the heritage asset, and despite no objections from the Council's conservation officer, in my judgement the harm to the host building and terrace would in turn cause harm to the significance of the CA. The harm that would arise would be localised and therefore, in terms of the approach in the Framework, the harm to the CA as a whole would be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the Framework states that where a development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a heritage asset, that harm and should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
10. Based on the foregoing, the development is harmful to the host building, terrace, local area and CA. This is contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026 (HLP) (adopted March 2013), Policy DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (adopted July 2017) and Policies D6 and HC1 of the London Plan (adopted March 2021). These seek, among other things, extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings.

Planning Balance

11. The Council informs that 2020 Housing Delivery Test figures show new housing in the Borough to be less than 75% of that required over the previous three years. Paragraph 11d of the Framework would generally be engaged and

indicates that relevant development plan policies are out of date. Planning permission should therefore be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole.

12. However, policies in the Framework which protect designated heritage assets are included in paragraph 11(d)(i) footnote 7. The proposed development would be contrary to paragraph 202 of the Framework, and the harm to the CA that I have identified above provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply in this instance.
13. In any event, additional living space for the roof flat would only benefit occupiers of the property, and/or the owner of the property through increased value or rent potential, and this would be private in nature. Accordingly, any benefits would be limited and would not outweigh the substantial weight attached to the harm to a designated heritage asset.
14. I have been provided with photographs of other extensions which are evidently similar to the appeal scheme. However, I have no further information on any of these. Moreover, one appears to be a front extension. As such these do not persuade me the extension subject to the appeal is acceptable.
15. I am also informed of an approved planning application², although I have little information on this matter before me. From the extract of the officer report provided, this refers to a mansard roof which would differ from the appeal development. In any event, the Council concluded that proposal acceptable, but it does not follow that the scheme before me should be allowed on this basis alone.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposal conflicts with the development plan and the Framework when considered as a whole. There are no other material considerations that suggest the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, and taking account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR

² HGY/2019/2401