
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 March 2025

by **C Housden BSc(Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3rd April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/24/3351566

33 Flat A, St Johns Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N15 6QJ

- 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 Stephenson and Shaffer against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/1661.
 - The development proposed is described as “loft conversion of the upper floor to provide a L shaped rear dormer with roof lights and two roof lights to front roof slope”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of the proposal differs between the application form and the decision notice. As the appellant has used the wording of the decision notice in their appeal form, in the interests of clarity, I have used this description in the banner heading.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. St Johns Road primarily comprises of two storey properties organised in long linear terraces, with some blocks of flats situated towards the junction with Albert Road. The ground levels decline as you travel along St Johns Road towards Albert Road. The area is suburban in character.
5. No 33 St Johns Road is a two-storey end of terrace property. It has a pitched roof and a rear outrigger extension. Flat A is situated on the first floor of the property. Adjacent to No 33, is an allotment which extends between St Johns Road and Franklin Street which provides a prominent break in the built form. Due to this open space, there is much greater visibility of the plot of No 33 from the public realm than other properties within the area. The rear roof slope and the side outrigger roof slope of No 33 are visible from both St Johns Road and Franklin Street.
6. The proposed dormers would be set down from the main ridge, however they would extend across the entire width of the rear main roof slope and side of the outrigger roof slope. As such, the appeal scheme adds excessive bulk and mass to the roof which would not have a subservient appearance to the property. The bulky design

would be a dominant feature on the appeal property which would detract from its character and appearance.

7. Furthermore, due to the siting of the appeal site next to the allotment, the extensions on both roof slopes would be a prevalent and an intrusive feature within the streetscene that would be contrary to the character and appearance of the area.
8. For these reasons, the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the area. Therefore, I find that the proposed development would conflict with Policy SP11 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (2017) and Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017). These policies seek to ensure development achieves a high standard of design that respects and contributes to the distinctive character and amenity of the site and local area.

Other Matters

9. I have been supplied with evidence from the appellant of an extension granted planning permission by the Council at Flat A 57, St Johns Road, that they feel is similar to this appeal. I have also been presented with photographs of examples of dormer extensions on properties within the area.
10. As I have explained in my decision, the site-specific end of terrace location adjacent to the allotment makes the appeal site particularly prominent within the area. In my view, this means that these cases are not directly comparable due to the site-specific circumstances of the appeal site.
11. In any case, I have considered the appeal before me on its individual planning merits and the presence of these examples do not persuade me that the appeal proposal is acceptable or otherwise justify the harm that I have identified in respect of the scheme.
12. I also acknowledge the appellant's concerns over the Council's handling of the application. However, this is not a matter that I can consider under a section 78 planning appeal and does not alter my findings, in which I have had regard solely to the planning merits of the proposal.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given, the proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Housden

INSPECTOR