



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 September 2023

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3313453

121 Vartry Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N15 6HB

- 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 Yakov Levy against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/4023, dated 6 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 15 December 2022.
 - The development proposed is loft conversion and extension with rear facing dormer and front elevation rooflights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have removed the words "revision to the existing planning permission HGY/2022/2476" from the description of development in the above header as this does not form part of the proposed development.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal relates to the first floor flat (number 121) within a two-storey mid-terrace property on Vartry Road. The property has an existing two storey outrigger shared with the adjoining neighbour and this outrigger is considered to be an original feature given that it is replicated at all other properties within this terrace row.
5. To the rear of the appeal property there is a short rear yard, used by occupants of the ground floor flat, and its rear boundary adjoins the side boundary of the rear yard serving the end terrace property on St. Johns Road. This neighbouring yard consists of mature trees and vegetation which currently obscure views towards the rear elevation of the appeal property from Heysham Road, which runs to the north. Vegetation situated in the rear yard of the end terrace property on Vartry Road also screens the rear elevation of the appeal site from St John's Road to the east of the appeal site.
6. Whilst rear dormers are not a particularly common feature of the wider area, there are some rear dormer extensions within the vicinity of the appeal site,

- and the appeal property itself does have an extant planning consent¹ for a rear dormer which would extend out partly onto the existing two storey outrigger.
7. The appeal also proposes a rear dormer extension, however in this case it would extend considerably further along the existing two storey outrigger than the previous approval. Nevertheless, the extant permission represents a viable fallback position and is a material consideration in the determination of this appeal.
 8. The difference between the extant permission and current appeal proposal is the length of the projection of the rear dormer along the existing two storey outrigger. The difference in projection is however considerable and would result in a very large dormer to the rear of the appeal property, which extends almost the full length of the large two storey outrigger, representing a disproportionate addition to the original roof. This large rear dormer would therefore result in an incongruous, excessive, disproportionate and bulky addition to the roofscape, to the visual detriment of the appearance of the host property and surrounding area in general.
 9. As such, whilst I accept that the appellant has a fallback position for a rear dormer, the extant permission and the current appeal proposal are not directly comparable, and the current appeal proposal would result in significantly greater visual harm than the extant permission due to its additional projection and massing.
 10. In coming to the above view, I acknowledge that the rear elevation of the appeal property is not highly prominent from surrounding streets. Nevertheless, the proposed dormer would be visible from the rear elevations, and rear yard areas, of several neighbouring properties. Furthermore, the proposed dormer would also be visible from sections of Heysham Road and St Johns Road if the existing vegetation, that currently provides screening, was to be removed from neighbouring land, or when this vegetation potentially shed their leaves in autumn and winter months.
 11. I have found no harm arising from the insertion of the proposed roof lights in the front elevation of the roof plane at the appeal property, as similar rooflights have been installed at a number of neighbouring properties along this street. However, this does not deflect from the harm that I have found that would be caused in relation to the proposed rear dormer
 12. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy D6 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2013) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) which together seek to ensure, amongst other things, that development proposals are of high-quality design, relate positively to their locality and respect the form and architectural characteristics of the original building.

¹ Planning Application Ref: HGY/2022/2476

Conclusion

13. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

R Major

INSPECTOR