



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2024

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 September 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/24/3340614

40 Cranley Gardens, Hornsey, Haringey, London N10 3AP

- 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 Barry Edwards against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey.
The application Ref HGY/2023/2882, dated 24 October 2023, was refused by notice dated 20 December 2023.
 - The development proposed is a two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a two storey semi-detached property in Cranley Gardens, at the junction with Leinster Road. Cranley Gardens is residential and, in the vicinity of the site, largely comprises semi-detached dwellings. While the precise design of these varies, pairs of dwellings maintain a symmetrical front form, flanked on the outermost sides by bay features. There is therefore a pleasing sense of consistency to this section of the street along the front elevations, to which the appeal property currently contributes positively.
4. The proposal seeks to erect a side extension at the appeal property, adjacent to Leinster Road. It would be two storeys in height when viewed from the front, reducing to a single storey, flat roofed section towards the rear. It would be set down from the main roof of the dwelling, set back from the front bay projection, behind the projection of the rear conservatory, and would be constructed from materials to match the existing dwelling.
5. Nevertheless, the proposal would be a sizeable addition at the site, introducing significant bulk to the appeal property. It would result in a complicated and disjointed arrangement of built form that would alter the current, simple dimensions and shape of the dwelling. Overall, it would read as a visually jarring feature at the site, readily experienced in the surrounds due to its prominent corner plot position where, despite the boundary treatments and its distance from the dwelling opposite, its bulk would be noticeable.

6. While the rear elevations of nearby properties on Cranley Gardens feature a range of projections and alterations, there is an overall consistency to the form of the front facades at this section of the street. Experienced in this context, and even noting that it would be less than half the width of the current front façade, the proposal would upset the front symmetry at this pair of semi-detached dwellings, appearing incongruous. Despite its setback, its side placement would reduce the prominence of the existing front bay feature, in contrast to most properties in the immediate surrounds where this prominence has been retained by a lack of side additions.
7. The proposal would also bring the built form of the appeal property closer to Leinster Road, masking views of the Leinster Road properties further north when viewed from Cranley Gardens, disrupting the overall legibility of this section of the street. It would also introduce a significant expanse of unbroken brick lining this part of the street due to its featureless side elevation. While this would ensure no adverse harm to living conditions of surrounding residents, it would nevertheless be an oppressive addition to this section of Leinster Road, highlighting the dominance of the proposal.
8. For the reasons given the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the site and the area. As such, it would fail to comply with Policy SP11 of the Haringey's Local Plan: Strategic Policies 2013-2026, and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey's Development Management DPD insofar as they seek to ensure development is of a design that respects, responds to, and relates to local context and character.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to the range of other extensions in the area. While limited information is provided in this regard, I observed the site and surrounds during my visit and have found for the reasons given that the proposal would result in visual harm. Each scheme is decided on its own site-specific merits and such reference to other development carries little weight.
10. It is agreed between the main parties that the proposal would not result in adverse harm to the living conditions of occupiers of surrounding properties or with regard to flood risk. Based on my observations I have no reason to disagree. These represent a lack of harm, neutral in the planning balance.
11. The proposal would not be a separate dwelling, but would create additional, ancillary living space for the appellant and their family, including elderly relatives with poor health. As such, it would optimise the use of the site and enable an extended family to live together. Nevertheless this, along with the other matters outlined above, would not outweigh the unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the site and area.
12. In considering this appeal I have also had due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in the Equality Act 2010, in particular the need to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations between those with protected characteristics and others. Following careful consideration of these particular matters I am satisfied that the impact of dismissing this appeal is proportionate and justified.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, the proposal would not accord with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

INSPECTOR