



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 November 2022

by S Crossen BA (Hons) PgCert PgDip MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/22/3301795

6 Spencer Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 9UU

- 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 Shlomo Gold against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref HGY/2022/1153, dated 4 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 May 2022.
- The development proposed is ground & first floor rear / infill extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for ground & first floor rear / infill extension at 6 Spencer Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 9UU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2022/1153, dated 4 April 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
2. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Existing – OS Map and Location Plan EXL001, Existing – Ground Floor EX-P001, Existing – First Floor EX-P002, Existing – Roof Plan EX-P003, Existing-Front/Rear Elevation EX-E001, Existing – Side Elevation 1 EX-E002, Existing – Side Elevation 2 EX-E003, Existing – Section AA EX-S001, Proposed – OS Map and Location Plan PR-L001, Proposed – Ground Floor PR-P001, Proposed – First Floor PR-P002, Proposed – Roof Plan PR-P003, Proposed – Front/Rear Elevation PR-E001, Proposed – Side Elevation 1 PR-E002, Proposed – Side Elevation 2 PR-E003, Proposed – Section AA PR-S001.
4. 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

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises a mid-terraced house and garden in a row of four houses with a shared gable outrigger between the two central houses and matching hipped roof rear projections at both the outer houses.

7. At my site visit I noted that a number of houses within the same street and the street to the rear had two storey rear extensions of varying designs and roof forms, including flat roofs. This variety contributes to the character and appearance of the area.
8. The development is a two storey, flat roof extension built at the back of the host building, partly replacing the existing similar depth rear wing, and in-filling the gap between this projection and the similar depth two-storey rear projection at the adjoining house.
9. The proposed extension has a similar depth to the existing projections to either side but has a lower height so it would be subordinate to the host building. The subordinate design and position to the rear of the house means that I do not find the proposed extension to be dominant within the row of houses.
10. The proposed part flat roof design would be similar to other two-storey flat roof rear extensions in the next terraced row, which can be seen from the garden area of the host building, and similar to the flat roof rear dormer at the adjoining house. Therefore, the development would be sympathetic to those existing designs. From the rear garden the symmetry of the terraced row is not prominent in the context of existing extensions and projections and the varied character of the area. Therefore, although the symmetry of the gaps between the centre two terraced houses and outer houses would be lost, the proposed extension would not be harmful to either the host building or the surrounding area.
11. Though the Council has raised concerns regarding the cumulative effect of the proposed extension and a proposed dormer at the host building (Ref HGY/2022/1154), the dormer is not before me and at the time of the Council's decision, the planning application for the dormer had not been determined.
12. I conclude that the development would not have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It therefore accords with Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan, Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026 March 2013, consolidated with alterations since 2017, policies DM1 and DM12 of Haringey London Development Management DPD adopted July 2017 and Policy D6 of The London Plan, The Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London, March 2021. These policies, amongst other things, seek development to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality.

Other Matters

13. In reaching my decision I note that some concerns were raised by interested parties in relation to the potential for the host building to become a House in Multiple Occupation, lack of parking, previous anti-social behaviour issues, poor building repair work and potential for future work to damage adjoining homes, construction length, noise, dust and debris, and loss of privacy. However, any inconvenience caused by construction would be for a temporary period only, particularly given the relatively modest scale of the development. I have no information before me regarding the issue raised about the development exceeding Neighbour Consultation Scheme rights which likely relates to Permitted Development rights, in any case the appellant has applied for planning permission. On the remaining matters the Council is satisfied they are not relevant to the development or can be managed through separate control and legislation, so having regard to the details of the proposed extension and

to the evidence before me, I can see no reason to disagree with the Council's conclusions in relation to these matters.

Conditions

14. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring that the development be constructed from materials matching the host building to ensure that the appearance of the development is acceptable.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole, the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework and all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Crossen

INSPECTOR