



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 December 2022

by I A Dyer BSc (Eng) FCIHT

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/22/3301394

72 Boundary Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N22 6AD

- 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 Philip Crawley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/0882, dated 6 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 11 May 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion with full width rear dormer and brick facing build up of party walls. Solar panels mounted to top of new dormer extension flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. 72 Boundary Road (No 72) is a mid-terrace two storey house of traditional design lying in an established residential area of predominantly similar properties.
4. The terraces have unified ridge lines, broken only by party walls and chimney stacks. Whilst some dwellings have been subject to alteration, the dwellings, within terraces, retain a high degree of consistency of design, particularly when viewed from the street. This consistency is an important positive feature of the area.
5. To the rear, alterations, such as rear roof dormers, are apparent. These are visible in views from Belmont Park Recreation Ground (the recreation ground) and Belmont Infants and Junior schools (the schools).
6. The proposed dormer would extend from the ridge to the eaves and be built up directly from the party walls. There would be no set-in from any of these existing features and it would subsume the common feature of the party walls. The dormer would be a large, box like structure on the rear roof face of the terrace, extending the rear façade of No 72 upwards and thus giving the appearance to the dwelling, when viewed from the rear, of a three storey, flat roofed dwelling. This would be in contrast to the form of the dwellings to either side within the terrace and appear incongruous and dominant in views. This

incongruity, which would be visible from the recreation ground and the schools would constitute material harm to No 72 and the terrace.

7. Other rear dormer extensions have been added to the rear slopes of dwellings on Boundary Road. My attention has been particularly drawn to those on 40, 42, 62 and 86 Boundary Road (Nos 40, 42, 62 and 86), which lie on the same side as the appeal site, and 79 Boundary Road (No 79) which lies on the opposite side.
8. Whilst I have little information about the developments at Nos 40, 42, 60 and 80, other than the Council's statement that they did not receive planning permission, these dormers do exist and therefore, to a greater or lesser degree, inform local context. They form incongruous additions to the rear roof slopes of the terraced dwellings but are not a prevalent feature. Additional large dormers would further undermine the important character and appearance that I have identified above as an important positive feature contributing to the character and appearance of the area.
9. The rear dormer of No 79 does not appear in direct context of the proposed site, being on the rear slope of a dwelling on the opposite side of the street. Further, No 79 features an existing two-storey rear outrigger from the main part of the dwelling and so the bulk and massing of No 79 does not correlate to that of No 72. I do not therefore consider that these present a similar context to the proposal before me. I have, in any case, determined this appeal on its own merits.
10. My attention has been drawn to Haringey Council's Supplementary Planning Document 'House Extension in South Tottenham'. However, the appeal site does not lie in the South Tottenham area and therefore this does not directly apply as planning guidance for the development before me.
11. The proposed solar panels, which would be angled to the flat roof of the proposed extension, would project above the ridge line of No 72. This would produce an incongruous and alien feature that would break the roof line, out of keeping with the consistent roof line. I have identified this as an important feature of the character and appearance of the area, and it would attract the eye of passers-by by virtue of its inconsistency. This inconsistency and incongruity would constitute material harm.
12. The appellant has suggested that other types of solar panels could be used as an alternative to those shown on the plans, which would lie flat and therefore would not appear above the ridgeline when viewed from the street. However, those did not form part of the proposal before me. I have determined this appeal on the basis of the submitted documents, and these show angled solar panels.
13. I therefore conclude that the development would result in material harm to the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the provisions of Policy D3 of The London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017) in as much as these seek to respect or enhance local context and character.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has indicated that he is dissatisfied with the way in which the Council has dealt with his application. This, however, is a matter between the appellant and the Council.

Conclusion

15. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other considerations which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal fails.

I A Dyer

INSPECTOR