

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2022

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th November 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/22/3304564
71 Connaught Gardens, London, N10 3LG

- 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 Ms Rachel Carrell against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/0994, dated 19 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 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, London, N10 3LG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2022/0994, dated 19 March 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1824-A-: 00; 01; 02; 03; 04; 05; 06; 07; 08; 09; 10; 11.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. There is one main issue which is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the street scene of Connaught Gardens.

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a detached two-storey house set on a curve in the street and at the lower end of Connaught Gardens which rises to the south. Connaught Gardens is characterised by large dwellings of similar age and traditional design. However, whilst the street exhibits a cohesive character, the
-

architecture varies and there are examples of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties. Many properties, including the appeal dwelling, have undergone extension and alteration.

4. The proposed extension would be above an existing large single storey addition. It would be set well back from the main façade and also behind and set in from the front and side elevations of the single storey addition respectively. The design would generally match that of and be sympathetic to the existing house. In particular, the roof pitch would match that of the host dwelling, the front gable would have timber and herringbone brick infill to reflect the main bay and gable and the proposed window would reflect the scale and style of existing fenestration.
5. The scale of the extension would be clearly subservient to the host dwelling. It would have a significantly lower roof line and a width noticeably less than half the width of the existing first floor and slightly less than that of the main front bay. Its separation from the smaller bay on the opposite side of the dwelling, set back from it and lower profile would ensure it did not compete with it or detract from its appearance.
6. In terms of prominence in the street scene, the appeal site is set at a lower level than 69 Connaught Gardens. This, combined with the set back of the proposed extension, such that its building line would not project forward of the main front gable at No 69, would ensure it was not unduly dominant or intrusive when seen from higher ground to the south. Approaching from the north, the bend in the road would ensure that the proposed extension was not conspicuous, despite its more elevated position. The set in from the side elevation of the single storey addition would provide adequate separation from No 69 such that the two dwellings did not appear cramped or uncharacteristically close. Overall, the extension would assimilate well into the street scene.
7. The Council suggests that the proposed extension would be read in combination with the single storey addition below as a disproportionate two storey addition. However, because it would sit in from the front and side elevations of the single storey addition it would appear as a separate, subordinate addition that was in keeping with the original architecture and well proportioned in the context of the dwelling as a whole. Moreover, I find that, despite the rear section of the extension being closer to the shared boundary with No 69 and having an angled side elevation, this would be inconspicuous when seen from the street and would not be a discordant feature or detract from the character or appearance of the host dwelling or that of No 69.
8. The Council seeks to compare the proposed extension with first floor side extensions at Nos 63 and 69. However, these dwellings are of noticeably different design from the appeal dwelling and form either end of a distinctive and largely symmetrical group of four. I am not therefore persuaded that they are readily comparable with the appeal site or proposal.
9. It is concluded on the main issue that the proposed first floor side extension would have no materially detrimental effect on the character or appearance of the host dwelling or the street scene of Connaught Gardens. In consequence, it would comply with Policy D6 of the London Plan, 2021, Policy SP11 of the

Haringey Local Plan, Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026, 2013, or Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD, 2017. Taken together and amongst other things these expect new development, including extensions, to have a high standard of design such that it complements the original building and relates positively to the locality, having regard to form, scale, massing and distinctive local architectural styles, detailing and materials.

10. Turning to conditions, I agree with the Council that, in addition to the statutory commencement condition, conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans and in matching materials are necessary in order to provide certainty and to protect the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

11. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

KE Down
INSPECTOR