



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2024

by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/24/3339931

15 Caxton Road, Wood Green, Haringey, London N22 6TB

- 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 Dave Kingett against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey Council.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2023/3264.
 - The development proposed is described as dormers to main and outrigger roof slopes, Velux rooflight to front roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which has a two-storey outrigger to the rear. The outrigger is shared with its semi-detached pairing No.13 Caxton Road (No.13). The site is located on the edge of the centre of Wood Green, with a number of large commercial premises located in close proximity. The appeal site is located within a group of residential properties which consist of a variety of form although rear outriggers are a consistent characteristic of the dwellings on Caxton Road. These outriggers are all set below the eaves of the main roof and appear to be largely unaltered. The only exception is No.5 Caxton Road (No.5) which has an upward extension on the outrigger. Views of the rear of the property, and other dwellings on Caxton Road, are available between dwellings on Parkland Road.
4. The rear roof dormer to the main roof would be set down from the ridge by some distance, while it would also be set up from the eaves and in from the side of the roof. This would ensure that the rear dormer would not dominate the original roof slope. However, abutting that dormer would be a roof extension to the outrigger. This would, almost entirely, occupy the depth and width of the outrigger. By adding a further storey to this part of the dwelling it would protrude above the eaves of the main roof, which would erode the existing visual subservience. The outrigger extension would result in a discordant addition to the dwelling, which would also imbalance the form and relationship with No.13. Furthermore, the scale and positioning of the outrigger

extension would visually disrupt the established character of the wider rear roofscape of Caxton Road.

5. Due to the position, and overall height and depth of the extension, it would project significantly above garden boundaries and would be apparent in views between properties from Parkland Road. From here the extension would be prominent, appearing as an awkward addition that would jarringly contrast with the form of the dwelling and the adjacent roofscape. Further, the lack of any opening within the side elevation would exacerbate the extent of additional built form. While existing landscaping would provide some screening, I do not consider that it would be sufficient to lessen the visual prominence of the extension from the surrounding area.
6. I acknowledge that there are large commercial buildings within the area which are visually dominant. Nonetheless, these have their own character and are viewed beyond the residential roofscape. In addition, the recent flat roof housing development on Parkland Road also has its own distinct style as a contemporary dwelling. The extension to No.5, while similar to the proposals, does not occupy as much of the rear outrigger in comparison to the appeal proposal, and is also much further away from Parkland Road. Together, these factors lessen its prominence. Therefore, I find other development in the area to be contextually different and not directly comparable.
7. For the above reasons I consider that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), and policy D3 of The London Plan (2021). Together, amongst other things, these seek to deliver high quality design which relates positively to its locality.

Other matters

8. It is suggested that a similar development could be constructed under the provisions of the permitted development regulations. However, there is no substantive evidence before me to show exactly what could be achieved under these regulations to determine whether any fall-back position exists. Consequently, a comparison with the appeal proposal cannot be made. In any event, I have considered this scheme on its individual merits, in the light of the relevant development plan policies.
9. I acknowledge that the proposals would provide additional floor space and enhance existing housing stock, while also enhancing the energy efficiency of the dwelling. These are benefits of the scheme. Nevertheless, these benefits are limited to a single dwelling and matters to which I can only attach limited weight and not significant in my overall assessment. These benefits, therefore, would not outweigh the permanent harm that would arise to the character and appearance of the dwelling and wider area.

Conclusion

10. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR