
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2022 by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by R Sabu BA(Hons), MA, BArch, PgDip, RIBA, ARB

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/22/3291069

48 Ringslade Road, Wood Green, London N22 7TE

- 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 Jake Cadbury against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2021/2854, dated 16 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 11 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is raising main ridge line, form rear dormer and two rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for raising main ridge line, form rear dormer and two rooflights at 48 Ringslade Road, Wood Green, London N22 7TE in accordance with the terms of the application, ref: HGY/2021/2854, dated 16 September 2021, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no 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 plan: 1416/297-SK01.
 - 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 host dwelling.

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 the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is a terraced two-storey property on Ringslade Road. The dwellings along this section of Ringslade Road possess a uniformity in their form and relationship to the highway. The ridgelines of these dwellings largely step down in pairs to the south, awarding the street scene an attractive

rhythm. Although there is a consistency in the ridgelines of some of these pairs of dwellings, there is some variation in a number of these, with one of the pair being slightly higher than the other.

5. The appeal property is reflective of the other dwellings along this section of Ringslade Road with respect to its form and relationship to the highway. The ridgeline of the host dwelling is marginally lower than the adjoining No 50 Ringslade Road (No 50) with which it forms a pair. There is a noticeable step down in ridge height from the appeal building to the adjoining No 46 Ringslade Road (No 46). The appeal property is separated from the adjoining dwellings by an upstand protruding beyond the roof and ridge lines.
6. The proposal would increase the ridgeline of the host dwelling by approximately 0.19 metres which would result in a slight projection above that of No 50. Given the limited projection above No. 50, the proposal would appear consistent with other such variations between ridgelines observed within the street scene. Furthermore, the proposal would retain the stepping down of the pair to No. 46, preserving this important characteristic of the street scene.
7. The increase in ridge height would be facilitated through a slight offset in the existing position of the ridgeline to the rear of the property. The upstands between dwellings provide a visual break and mask any subtle variations between roof forms. Given the minor nature of this offset, combined with the upstands flanking the appeal property, the alteration in ridge position would not appear noticeable from the street scene. As such, the proposal would preserve the existing character of the street scene.
8. The proposed rear dormer is reflective in scale and character of other existing rear dormers along the terrace. The Council consider the proposed rear dormer to be acceptable with regards to its impact on the character and appearance of the street scene. Based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to disagree.
9. For the above reasons, the development would preserve the character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore accord with Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026 (2017), Policy D6 of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London March 2021, and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (2017) which together require development to be of high quality design and to respect the character of the local area.

Other Matters

10. I note that the occupiers of No. 50 raised the effect of the proposal on their living conditions, with particular regard to privacy. The Council has assessed this matter, concluding that the proposal would not result in any significant increase in overlooking. Based on the evidence before me, I have no reason to disagree with the Council in this regard.

Conditions

11. The standard time limit condition and condition specifying the approved plan are necessary for the reason of certainty. In order to safeguard the character and appearance of the area, a condition relating to matching materials is also necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

N Unwin

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

R Sabu

INSPECTOR