
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2023

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/22/3308687

20 Eade Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N4 1DH

- 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 Ms Hannah Schneebeli against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/1948, dated 1 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension comprising full width dormer to rear of main roof and outrigger roof extension with small balcony to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 2-storey mid-terrace dwelling of traditional style within a mainly residential area, wherein terraces predominate. At the rear of No 20 is a 2-storey outrigger with a mono-pitched roof that is paired with the attached property, 18 Eade Road. No 18 has a large flat roof dormer on its main rear roof slope that also extends along part of its outrigger.
4. A dormer extension is proposed on the main rear roof slope of No 20 and along part of its 2-storey outrigger with a first-floor terrace facing the back garden. Three new roof lights would also be placed onto the front roof slope of the dwelling. Together, the new dormer and roof lights would serve additional living accommodation within the converted roof space of the appeal property.
5. The new addition would be set back from the main rear wall and include a part flat, part mono-pitched roof at the same angle as that of the host building. It would restore the party wall between the rears of Nos 18 and 20. The proposal would also be a sizeable addition, extending across almost the full width of the main building and well over half the length of its outrigger. With a part flat roof and 'L' shape, albeit staggered in height, the new addition would appear as an overly large 'box-like' addition that would relate poorly to the traditional style, modest proportions, and general appearance of the host building.
6. The considerable scale and mass of the appeal scheme and its elevated position would give the completed building an awkward top-heavy appearance.

That the new dormer would be timber clad, in marked contrast with the brick walls of the existing dwelling, with fenestration that would neither line up with nor satisfactorily relate to the existing windows in the rear elevation, would visually accentuate its uneasy relationship with the host building.

7. The new dormer would be at the back of the host building, away from the road, and effectively screened by vegetation in views from along the nearby river particularly in summer. Consequently, there would be no discernible effect on the local street or riverside scenes. The new addition would nonetheless form part of the character of the local area as it is experienced and appreciated from nearby properties. From the back gardens of some dwellings in the same terrace as No 20, the new dormer would draw the eye as an overly large and visually dominant structure. That impression would be evident even among the varied existing built form on either side of the site that includes the rear dormer at No 18 and the full width rear dormer and second floor roof terrace at 24 Eade Road. Consequently, the proposal would be an obtrusive and visually disruptive feature and an unwelcome addition to the local area.
8. Other properties in the local area include sizeable rear dormers that are visible from public vantage points including those to which the appellant has referred and provided background details and photographs. Having viewed each of the cases cited, it is my view that roof level additions identified exemplify the harm to which I have referred and so do not set a desirable precedent. I also recognise the importance of ensuring consistency in making planning decisions. It seems to me that even if the Council has been inconsistent in deciding to approve rear dormer extensions elsewhere and not here, that is not in itself an appropriate reason to find in favour of the proposal. In other words, additional harm cannot be justified simply because some harm already exists.
9. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it conflicts with Policy D3 of The London Plan, Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Council's Development Management DPD and Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan. These policies aim to ensure that new development achieves high quality design that respects the architectural characteristics of the host building and contributes to the distinctive character of the local area.
10. Once complete, the proposal would provide additional living accommodation and extra space for home working that would improve the living conditions of the appellant and family. It would also enable the fabric of the property to be upgraded with improvements to its thermal insulation and energy efficiency. As the appellant says that the existing roofs at the rear of No 20 are poorly insulated and leak, I can understand the desire to make these improvements. A good-sized garden would remain with the new built form in place. I also note that others raise no objection. However, these considerations do not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.
11. In conclusion, the proposed development would conflict with the development plan, as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR