



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 May 2024

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 May 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/23/3334275

1 Ferrestone Road, Hornsey, Haringey London N8 7BX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Jonas Grau against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2022/4522.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of an existing single storey domestic garage and erection of a three storey over part-basement, four-person (2b/4p) house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether appropriate living conditions would be provided for future occupiers of the proposal, with particular regard to outlook and outdoor amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. Ferrestone Road is characterised by uniformly designed, predominantly red brick, two storey, pitched roof terraced dwellings. The dwellings have projecting two storey box bay windows, hipped roofed front dormers and open porches. There is a consistent building line with the dwellings set back from the road behind front gardens, the majority of which are retained by a low brick wall. This gives a strong rhythm and a sense of order to the street scene which contributes positively to its attractive appearance.
4. The proposed dwelling would be attached to the end property as a continuation of the terrace. Whilst the proposal would fill the width of the plot in the same manner as the existing properties, its front elevation would be noticeably narrower. The projecting bay at first and second floor level would also be significantly wider than the bay windows within the terrace, and would, in part, extend forward of the building line. Furthermore, the open frontage and parking space would contrast with the enclosed front gardens of Ferrestone Road. Overall, the sense of rhythm and order within the street scene would be unacceptably disrupted to the detriment of its character and appearance and

would result in the proposal appearing cramped when viewed from public vantage points.

5. I acknowledge that sympathetic facing materials are proposed and that attempts have been made to design a modern interpretation of the streetscape. Nonetheless, for the above reasons, the proposal would not sit well with the established pattern of development of the area and would appear as an intrusive and discordant addition to the street scene to its detriment.
6. The proposal would not impact on the historic environment as the site is not located in a Conservation Area. However, this is a neutral factor that does not outweigh the harm that I have found.
7. I find therefore that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies DM1, DM7 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (DPD), Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (HLP) and Policy D4 of the London Plan (LP) which seek to deliver high quality design and development that relates appropriately to the surrounding area and established street scene.

Living conditions

8. There is no compelling evidence before me to suggest that the natural light that would be received within the ground floor room, through the proposed inverted bay, would be inadequate. Nevertheless, if used as a bedroom, as shown on the appeal plans, it would be a habitable room and should be provided with a suitable outlook. A reasonable outlook would also be required if utilised as a home office or playroom, as that could still involve regular use for long periods. However, as only a view of the sky would be possible, the outlook would be poor and unacceptable. A window would not be required if the room was utilised for storage purposes, but that would be unlikely as a large storage area is proposed in the basement.
9. The Council accept that the amount of amenity space provided on the roof terrace accords with the standards set out in the LP. They have, however, raised concerns about the height of the space and the absence of outdoor space at ground floor level. Nonetheless, the provision of amenity space above ground floor level is commonplace within developments comprising flats and there is no compelling evidence before me to suggest that would not be suitable for a dwellinghouse. Accordingly, I find that the extent and nature of the outdoor amenity space is sufficient, and, in that regard, adequate living conditions would be provided for the future occupiers of the proposal.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not provide suitable living conditions for the future occupiers of the proposal regarding outlook. Consequently, the proposal would conflict with HLP Policy SP11 and DPD Policies DM1, DM7 and DM12 which seek high quality design of residential units and amenity.
11. The Council has also referred to LP Policy D6 in its second reason for refusal. However, as I have not found the proposal to be unacceptable in respect of light and outside space there is no conflict with this policy.

Other Matters

12. The proposal would contribute towards the Government's aims of boosting the supply of housing and making an effective use of previously developed land, as set out in the Framework. However, there is nothing before me to suggest that the Council does not have a five-year housing land supply and that current policy is not providing enough housing to meet the requirements for the area. I therefore attach limited weight to the provision of a single dwelling as proposed. Benefits to the local economy would also be limited due to the small scale of the scheme.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweighs the identified harm and associated development plan conflict.
14. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR