



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 January 2023

by M J Francis BA (Hons) MA MSc MCIfA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3302721

43 Chalgrove Road, Tottenham, London N17 0NS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission
 - The appeal is made by Mr Y Rosenberg against the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/0503, is dated 3 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as mansard loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused.

Main Issue

2. The appeal is against the failure of the Council to determine the planning application. I do not have putative reasons for refusal before me. However, having considered the suite of evidence submitted, I find the main issue in this appeal to be the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house and the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is located within a residential area and is a mid-terraced, two-storey house in a short row of similar properties. It is built using a pale brick with horizontal bands of red brick creating a decorative feature. The front of the house has a bay window, with stone surrounds, looking onto a small garden with a brick boundary wall. The existing roof, which is pitched with a central gully, is set below a parapet. To the rear there is a two-storey, original brick extension with a mono-pitched roof and two single storey, flat-roofed modern extensions.
4. The proposed mansard roof would have brick-built sides which would extend above the height of the existing roof by a considerable amount so that the side cheeks would stand proud above the existing roofline. The front and rear of the roof, which would be mono pitched at the front, flat at the top and vertical at the rear, would be externally finished with zinc. It would also have two large rooflights at the front and two substantial windows at the rear.
5. As No 43 is mid-terraced and forms part of a consistently designed block, the proposed mansard loft conversion, which would extend from the front to the rear, would represent an incongruous addition in this location. Indeed, it would be a top heavy and cumbersome addition which would unbalance the roofscape of both the house and the terraced row. The use of zinc and the insertion of

large windows to the front and rear, would increase the extension's conspicuousness and emphasise its uncharacteristic form in this location.

6. The terrace in which No 43 is sited, and a similarly designed terrace further along Chalgrove Road to the south, are distinctive within the street both for the colour of the brick, and because they are constructed with a parapet at the front. As none of these properties appear to have had substantive additions to their roofs, a unified appearance is apparent when viewed from Chalgrove Road vantage points, and particularly from the junction with Manor Road. Therefore, the introduction of the mansard loft conversion would detract from the consistent design that is integral to the character and appearance of this residential street.
7. The appellant has provided a list of planning applications for proposals for roof extensions within the London Borough of Haringey. However, I do not have full details of these cases and so I cannot be sure whether they are comparable with this proposal. In any case, these other sites are in different locations, and I have determined the appeal on its own merits, based on the evidence and site-specific circumstances before me.
8. Therefore, I conclude that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the house and the area. It would not accord with Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026, adopted March 2013 and consolidated with alterations since 2017, Policy DM1 of Haringey's Development Management DPD, adopted July 2017, and Policy D6 of The London Plan, March 2021. These policies, amongst other provisions, seek high quality design which respects local context and character.

Other Matters

9. I have noted an objection raised by an interested party with respect to the potential for sunlight and daylight to be blocked. However, as I have found the proposal to be unacceptable for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to explore this matter any further here.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR