



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: 08 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/23/3330867

6 Hardy Passage, Wood Green N22 5NZ

- 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 Jody Lyster, Hermitage Construction & Development Ltd, against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2023/1788, dated 4 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2023.
 - The development proposed is new mansard roof over flat roof to convert front 1st floor flat from a flat to a 4 person maisonette.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for new mansard roof over flat roof to convert front 1st floor flat from a flat to a 4 person maisonette at 6 Hardy Passage, Wood Green N22 5NZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2023/1788, dated 4 July 2023, and subject to the following 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 (Drawing No PL/00); Site plan (Drawing No SP/00); Existing Plans (Drawing No PL/01); Existing section A-A and north elevation (Drawing No PL/02); Existing east, west and south elevations (Drawing No PL/03); Proposed plans (Drawing No PL/04); Proposed front, rear and south elevations (Drawing No PL/05); and Proposed north elevation and section A A in context (Drawing No PL/06).
 - 3) With the exception of the proposed green roof shown on Drawing No PL/06, the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) The frosted glass screen shown on Drawing No PL/04 shall be provided prior to occupation of the mansard and shall thereafter be permanently retained.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with regards to outlook and privacy.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal site is a two-storey flat-roof building situated at the end of the terrace which runs along Hardy Passage. With its parapets and attractive brick frontage, the largely unaltered flat-roof terrace has a consistent overall design and two-storey scale. However, the differing heights of the front parapets introduce variety into its roofscape and composition, whilst a relatively large roof-top satellite dish in the middle of the row breaks up the roofline. The parapet on the site's southern elevation is also notably higher and there is a building towards the other end of the terrace with a conspicuously higher front parapet and overall height. In addition, the surrounding area includes a wide variety of building heights and appearances, and the site is read in this mixed-character context.
4. Although the proposed development would not be seen from directly in front of the site, it would be visible from some vantage points in the locality, including from surrounding properties and from the southern end of Hardy Passage, where its full extent would be visible. However, whilst it would add height to the building, its modest scale and set-back at the front and rear, combined with the height of the existing side parapet and the varied parapet heights along Hardy Passage, mean that it would appear as a relatively insignificant, subordinate, non-intrusive addition. With its end-of-terrace position, it would also counterbalance and reflect the height towards the other end and, given it would generally only be visible in medium/longer-distance views, it would be read in the context of the varied built form in the surrounding area. In addition, the mansard's roof profile and walls being finished in matching bricks mean it would respect the terrace's overall design and appear as a congruous addition.
5. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. I therefore find that it accords with Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (DMDPD), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026 (LPSP) and Policy D6 of the London Plan (LP). Amongst other aspects, these require development to be of a high, site-specific and sensitive design quality; and respect, positively relate and contribute to the locality's sense of place and character.

Adjoining occupiers

6. With the limited degree of separation between existing buildings, the proposed development would be relatively close to surrounding residential units. However, it would be reasonably well set-back from the rear of the site and partially screened by the existing parapet. Combined with the mansard's modest scale and the limited presence of the frosted-glass screen (due its height and glazed design), the appeal proposal would therefore not result in a significant reduction in outlook for existing occupiers of the nearest properties. With the screen being finished in frosted glass and up to 1.8 metres high, views of surrounding properties from the proposed terrace would also be obscured and therefore, despite its elevated position, limited.
7. In addition, I observed on my site visit that, due to the area's built-up nature, mutual overlooking is already possible between properties and outlook is limited in some circumstances. In this context, and given my findings above,

the proposed development would therefore not result in an unacceptable reduction in the levels of outlook or privacy of adjoining occupiers.

8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not harm the living conditions of adjoining occupiers with regards to outlook and privacy. I therefore find that it accords with DMDPD Policies DM1 and DM12, LPSP Policy SP11 and LP Policy D6. Amongst other aspects, these require development to be of a high quality design that takes account neighbouring uses, ensures a high standard of privacy and amenity for neighbours, and creates high quality places.

Other matters

9. Although near to the Grade II Listed Wood Green Underground Station, the Council sets out that the site does not fall within its curtilage and identifies that the appeal proposal would not harm its setting. On the basis of the available evidence, I have no reason to disagree. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the proposed development would preserve the setting and significance of the designated heritage asset.
10. A number of other matters have been raised by interested parties and I have taken them all into account. This includes: the proposal increasing the demand for parking and adding to existing problems with overflowing rubbish and fly tipping; the development's target demographic exacerbating existing social challenges in the area; basic living and internal size standards not being met; previous similar proposals on the site being refused planning permission; and the outdoor space being inadequate for future occupiers. However, whilst I take these representations seriously, I have not been presented with compelling evidence to demonstrate that the appeal proposal would result in unacceptable effects in relation to any of these matters. Consequently, they do not lead me to a different overall conclusion that the appeal should be allowed. In addition, with each case determined on its own merits, allowing this development would not set a precedent.

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. The Council has not suggested any conditions. However, in addition to the standard time limit, I have imposed a plans condition in the interests of certainty. I have also imposed conditions covering external materials and provision of the frosted glass screen in the interests of the character and appearance of the surrounding area and the living conditions of adjoining occupiers respectively.

T Gethin

INSPECTOR