



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2025

by **F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/24/3351930

Shop, 155 Mount Pleasant Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N17 6JH

- 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 Kemal Koca against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/1809.
 - The development is retrospective application to retain front extension, with retractable canopy and shutters.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development above is taken from the appeal form, which differs from that on the application form. The change in the description was agreed with the Council and is the one used on the decision notice. The development has been constructed therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is an end of terrace property within a predominantly residential area. It forms part of a row of traditional terraces which have a strong building line with a regular setback from the footpath. Despite some differences in appearance, there is uniformity at ground floor level with no front extensions and properties are in general harmony with each other. There are other commercial premises on the opposite side of The Avenue which have a wide section of paving adjacent to the footpath. Boundary treatments are generally low and in combination with the setback of properties this results in the area having open qualities. The similarity in the general scale of the built form creates a sense of balance that contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The ground floor extension at the appeal site sits prominently adjacent to the footpath in a location where there is a general absence of built form. Its significant projection from the main elevation disrupts the consistent building line along the street. Owing to the flat roof it is a bulky, dominant addition that fails to respond to the prevailing pattern of development and stands out as being visually incongruous as a consequence. Given the prominent corner plot location, the detrimental effect

the development has on the open qualities of the area is readily apparent on approach in either direction on The Avenue and on approach from the north on Mount Pleasant Road.

6. Although it is single storey, the boxy appearance of the extension unbalances the otherwise harmonious character of the area, and it has a poor degree of integration with the appeal property. In doing so it draws the eye and detracts from the visual and architectural interest of the appeal property's main elevational treatment on the upper floors. Despite the use of brickwork to match the appeal property, and notwithstanding that a contemporary approach to design can be appropriate in some circumstances, the development's incongruous effect is exacerbated by the use of modern materials which are largely absent from the surrounding area.
7. Even though the footprint of the development and the previous shopfront are similar, the relationship between the dimensions of the development and solid elevations results in it having noticeably bulkier proportions than the previous shopfront. The development is said to enhance the functionality of the property and has been in place for a period of time. However, these are not reasons in themselves to allow development that does not make a positive contribution to the area and does not improve its character and quality, as required by the development plan.
8. Overall, the development is unduly harmful to the character and appearance of the area and conflicts with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM8 of the Development Management DPD (2017). These policies, amongst other things, require development to deliver good design, high quality places and to relate positively to their locality. In addition, shopfronts are required to contribute to an attractive environment.

Conclusion

9. My above findings bring the development into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR