



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 February 2025

by **SJ Desai BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 03 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/24/3357202

70 Stanhope Gardens, Tottenham, Haringey, London N4 1HT

- 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 Windsor Smith against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/2536.
 - The development proposed is a first-floor rear extension over existing ground floor kitchen.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description on the planning application form in the banner heading.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a two storey, mid-terrace dwelling, that is located on the southern side of Stanhope Gardens. The rear of the dwelling includes an original two-storey outrigger, which forms part of a pair with a matching outrigger at the adjacent 68 Stanhope Gardens, both characterised by pitch roofs. A single storey extension has also been erected.
5. The dwelling is typical of the development in the surrounding area, with the rear elevations of the wider terrace generally characterised by evenly spaced pairs of two-storey outriggers. These features combine to give the rear elevation of the terrace a strong rhythm, a reasonably uniformed form and pleasant visual balance.
6. The proposed development would extend the outrigger outwards at first floor level beyond the established first floor rear building line, resulting in a dominant feature disrupting the marked balance and rhythm described above, both in terms of the host building and the surrounding pattern of development.
7. The proposed flat roof design would not be compatible with the roof form of the existing outrigger, its pair at No. 68, or that prevalent at surrounding properties. The proposed development therefore fails to complement the form and architectural

characteristics of the host building and wider terrace, representing a harmful contribution to local character.

8. Consequently, the extension would not be sympathetic to the host building harming its character. It would appear dominant and look incongruous when viewed from the garden of the appeal property, neighbouring gardens and from public views in Doncaster Gardens and at the entrance to the nearby community garden, harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
9. I therefore find the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding area. As such, it would conflict with Policy D6 of the London Plan 2021, Policies DM1 and DM12 of the London Borough of Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017 and Policy SP11 of the London Borough of Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 which require, amongst other criteria, that extensions or alterations deliver the highest standard of design and respect the form, setting and architectural characteristics of the original building and surrounding context.

Other matters

10. The appellant refers to other first floor extensions within the wider terrace. Whilst a number of outriggers at neighbouring properties do have a deeper rear projection than at the appeal property, these maintain a symmetry of form, are positioned away from the appeal property and are not seen in the same context. These other forms of development do not lead me to a different conclusion.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

SJ DESAI

INSPECTOR