



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2024

by T Gethin BA (Hons), MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 05 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/23/3325345

Flat C, 56 Upper Tollington Park, Hornsey, Haringey, London N4 4BX

- 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 Jenny Lynn Walsh against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/3849, dated 20 October 2022, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as: The proposal is to provide a loft conversion to the top floor flat. Associated internal works include replacing existing PVC windows with traditional sash windows. New loft space will provide additional bedroom, bathroom & walk-in wardrobe. Existing stair will be extended to improve access to the loft space. Moving one of the bedrooms upstairs will allow to create an open plan KITCHEN / DINING on the lower floor, which is more suitable for modern family life.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for installation of rear dormer window, addition of two front rooflights, replacement of second floor windows and re-roofing with natural slates at Flat C, 56 Upper Tollington Park, Hornsey, Haringey, London N4 4BX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2022/3849, dated 20 October 2022, and subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal's description is taken from the Council's decision notice, which better captures the development's scope than that on the application form.
3. As the proposal is in a conservation area (CA), I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, as set out in section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Stroud Green CA, with particular regard to the rear dormer.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a three-storey mid-terrace property facing Upper Tollington Park. To the front, the terrace has a traditional, consistent appearance and form, and contains various recurring architectural features which provide a sense of regularity to the street's residential character. Whilst the row therefore positively contributes to the streetscene and surrounding area, the

various differing rear projections, features and fenestration mean that the rear of the terrace, despite its largely unaltered roofscape, has a more varied appearance. Although facing Upper Tollington Park and being situated in a relatively long terrace, the back of the appeal site is clearly visible from Florence Road. The varied rear elevations of other properties in the terrace are also visible in public views, including 48 Upper Tollington Park and its rear dormer. There are similarly attractive terraced properties in the locality and some other dormers, such as at 73 Upper Tollington Park, are also visible from the public realm.

6. The site is within the Stroud Green CA. On the basis of the submitted evidence and my site visit observations, the CA's significance stems from, amongst other things, its collection of traditional buildings and its architectural and historic streetscape qualities. As set out above, the terraced row which the site is within positively contributes to the CA, particularly in relation to its pleasing, homogenous frontage.
7. The proposed rear dormer would be reasonably large. Given the site's position towards the end of the terrace, it would also be relatively conspicuous. However, it would be set in either side of the property's pitched roof and set above the eaves. Although the roof of the dormer would be broadly level with the ridge, a reasonable amount of the (re-tiled) rear pitched roof would therefore remain. Whilst the dormer's rooflight would project slightly above the ridge, its narrow width and set-back position mean that the additional height would not be particularly noticeable or prominent. Although the proposed dormer would change the look of the property's rear elevation and its roofscape, it would therefore be a sufficiently subordinate addition which would not read as an unacceptably bulky, dominant or intrusive feature in the terrace or surrounding area. The lack of a heritage statement does not lead me to a different conclusion. In coming to this view, I have also taken into account that the rear roof of the property and much of the terrace are largely unaltered.
8. Dormers are not prevalent on the terrace or surrounding area, and those at Nos 48 and 73 are situated in less prominent positions than the proposed dormer. Nevertheless, on my site visit I observed that both cover a reasonable proportion of the host buildings' roofs and are visible in public views (despite trees providing some screening, particularly to No 73). The dormer's set down from No 73's ridge is also not particularly obvious from ground level, where most public views are likely to occur. With neither being noticeably smaller nor significantly more screened in public views, the proposed dormer would therefore not read as an inappropriate or unexpected feature in the locality.
9. The installation of two rooflights on the property's front roof would introduce features that are not widespread in the locality. However, they would be relatively modest and not particularly visible from the public highway due to the roof pitch and the height of the building. Some other properties in the locality, including on the same terrace, also contain rooflights. Subject to securing further details via condition, the proposed front rooflights would therefore neither be incongruous nor read as harmful, intrusive features in the historic streetscape. In addition, replacing the existing roof tiles with slate and the proposed replacement timber sash windows would represent improvements compared to the existing situation.

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the Stroud Green CA, whose significance would be preserved. I therefore find that it accords with Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026, Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD, and Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan. Amongst other aspects, these seek to optimise site capacity through development which respects and responds to local character and is of the most appropriate form for the site and its context; set out that the Council will ensure the conservation of Haringey's heritage assets; expect development proposals to achieve a high standard of design, relate and contribute to the locality's character and sense of place, and conserve the significance of heritage assets; and require alterations and extensions to complement the host building, not be overbearing or intrusive and have a high, site-specific and sensitive design quality. The proposal would also be consistent with the provisions in the National Planning Policy Framework in relation to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Conclusion and Conditions

11. For the above reasons, and having had regard to all other matters raised and the submitted evidence, I conclude that the proposed development accords with the development plan. The appeal is therefore allowed.
12. In addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed a plans condition in the interests of certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area, I have also imposed a condition requiring further details of windows and roof slates to be submitted to and approved by the Council prior to their installation. However, for the sake of clarity and given that the details are not needed prior to the commencement of all works on site, I have amended the wording from that suggested by the Council. Given this condition covers all windows, including the rooflights, the Council's other suggested condition is not necessary. I have therefore declined to impose it.

T Gethin

INSPECTOR

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan (2206.001); First floor existing (2206.004); Second floor existing (2206.005); Roof plan existing (2206.006); Section AA existing (2012.010); Side elevation existing (2206.021); Front elevation existing (2206.020); Rear elevation existing (2206.021); Second floor proposed (2206.055); Loft plan proposed (2206.056); Roof plan proposed (2206.057); Section AA proposed (2012.060); Side elevation proposed (2206.061); Front elevation proposed (2206.070); and Rear elevation proposed (2206.071).
- 3) Prior to installation of the external windows and roof slates hereby permitted, the following shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: detailed drawings to a scale of 1:20 to confirm the detailed design and materials of the windows (including plan, elevation and section drawings indicating jamb, head, cill, reveal and surrounds of all external windows, including the rooflights); and a sample of the roof slates proposed showing the colour, texture and material detailing. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter.

END OF SCHEDULE