



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: 24 February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3308785

62-64 Wellington Avenue, Tottenham, Haringey, London N15 6BA

- 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 Everley Estates Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/1925, dated 5 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is part single storey rear extension at No.64 together with first floor rear extension across No.62 and 64 Wellington Avenue.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 62 and 64 Wellington Avenue (Nos 62 and 64), having particular regard to the availability of outdoor amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal relates to two adjoining properties, Nos 62 and 64, located within a residential area typically comprised of similarly designed terraced houses such that a formal residential character and appearance is identifiable local to the site. No 64 is located at the end of a terrace at the junction of Wellington Avenue and Leadale Road.
4. Both properties have already had substantial extensions. No 64 has had the roof raised to allow for the addition of a second storey and the creation of rooms within the roof space. It also has a ground floor, flat roofed extension at the rear. No 62 has also been extended with a large, flat roofed dormer stretching from the front to the rear of the house, and a large, single storey, ground floor extension on which a small first floor extension has been constructed.
5. The proposal would extend the ground floor, single storey extension at the rear of No 64 by a mere 380mm. At first floor level an extension would be built

above this and the existing ground floor extension at No 62. As this would extend 2.5 metres from the rear elevation at first floor level and be 7.82 metres in total width, it would result in a large, significant extension, across the rear of these two properties. The apex of the hipped roof extending up to just below the second-floor windows would result in a discordant and overly prominent addition to the rear elevation.

6. The properties are located at the end of the terraced row and so the proposed development would be highly visible from Leadale Road. The cumulative effect of the proposal, when experienced together with previous extensions, outbuildings, and No 64's extended gable elevation flanking Leadale Road, would read as excessive and overly intensive development to the rear of the properties detrimental to the character and appearance of the host terrace and wider residential area. Whilst the proposal would also remove the current first floor flat roofed extension at the rear of No 62, this is set well below the second-floor windows and is much smaller in scale than the proposed first floor addition.
7. No 64 has an extant permission¹ for a rear first floor extension. This would extend further from the rear elevation but would not be as wide as the proposal. Although the proposed extension being placed centrally across the two houses would have a symmetrical appearance, the length and volume of the extension would be more intrusive than the single extension that has permission at No 64. Hence, I find that the extant permission, if implemented, would be less harmful than the proposal before me.
8. The appellants have cited other properties on Wellington Avenue which have had permission for extensions of similar type which they consider set a precedent for the appeal proposal. Although I was able to view the front of these properties on Wellington Avenue, I was unable to view any of the rear extensions referenced. This is principally because these other properties do not occupy highly visible end-of-terrace corner plots, like No 64. I have also not been provided with full details of these cases which would better enable me to consider whether the other developments are in fact comparable. As such, when also noting the lack of any direct visual connection to the appeal site, the other examples referred to are of limited relevance to my consideration of this main issue.
9. In conclusion, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not accord with Policy D6 of the London Plan (March 2021) (the London Plan), Policy SP11 of the Haringey's Local Plan, Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (March 2013) (the Haringey LP), and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (July 2017) (the Haringey DPD). Collectively, these policies, amongst other provisions, seek to achieve high quality design that respond to the site and area.

Living conditions

10. Both Nos 62 and 64 Wellington Avenue have limited garden space to the rear. This is a result of the layout of the house plots when the area was originally developed, plus the ground floor extensions that have been built in the garden areas to the rear. No 64 also has a shed and a garage within the rear garden.

¹ HGY/2021/0543

11. The House Extensions in South Tottenham, Supplementary Planning Document, First Revision (October 2013) (the SPD) sets out that extensions will not normally be permitted which leave a rear garden of less than 50 square metres. Whilst the proposed extension to the existing ground floor projection would slightly reduce the garden space of No 64, the change would be very minor and could not be fairly considered to result in harm to on-site living conditions per se. This is even when acknowledging the aforementioned SPD guidance and the additional floorspace that is proposed.
12. The scale and massing of the proposal, combined with the existing extensions would result in an over dominant form of development in character and appearance terms. However, the first-floor extension would be set back from the rearmost parts of the ground floor extensions, and would not unacceptably overshadow, or be experienced as unduly overbearing from, adjacent rear garden spaces. Therefore, whilst the garden areas at the rear of Nos 62 and 64 are small, the proposal would have little effect on the outdoor space available and its useability by the occupiers of both dwellings.
13. For the above reasons, having particular regard to the availability of outdoor amenity space, the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 62 and 64. Therefore, the proposal accords with London Plan Policies D3 and D6, Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey DPD and Policy SP11 of the Haringey LP, only in so far as these policies require that development proposals must ensure a high standard of amenity for the development's users.

Conclusion

14. The development would not comply with the development plan when read as a whole, and material considerations do not lead me to a decision otherwise.
15. Whilst I have found that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of Nos 62 and 64, considerable harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the area. That harm is the overriding consideration in this case.
16. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

M J Francis

INSPECTOR