



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 17 April 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/24/3357361

37 Sirdar Road, Wood Green, London N22 6QS

- 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 Selwynco Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/2114.
 - The development proposed is proposed first floor side extension to include previously approved single-storey rear extension and previously approved garage conversion with chimney and pitched roof over.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the determination of this application, the Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024 and updated it on 7 February 2025. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought further submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site, 37 Sirdar Road is a ground floor flat within a two storey, end terrace building. It is prominently located on the corner of Sirdar Road and Hawke Park Road. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, the properties on this part of Sirdar Road were built as flats.
5. The surrounding area is characterised by terraced buildings which exhibit a high degree of uniformity in their design and layout. The areas to the side of the end terraced properties on this part of Sirdar Road and along Hawke Park Road, have mostly single storey garages, contributing to a more spacious character and affording views along Hawke Park Road towards the Belmont Recreation Ground.
6. The proposed development would involve the erection of a first-floor side extension along the flank wall of the main building. As such the height and width of the first-floor extension would create an imbalance and visual intrusion into the

street scene. The proposed extension would also bring the built form of the appeal property closer to Hawke Park Road disrupting the rhythm and uniformity of the street scene.

7. Although the depth of the first-floor extension would be set back from the front by approximately 0.8 metres, the proposed extension, which would extend the full width of the plot would result in the loss of the sense of spaciousness to the side of the appeal property which is a positive feature of the area. As a result, it would be viewed as a dominant addition to the host property that would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area.
8. I acknowledge that the neighbouring property, No. 39 Sirdar Road has been extended to the rear with some bulky and prominent alterations. However, the proposed two storey extension would be located to the side of the appeal property and as a result would not alter views of these extensions. Furthermore, the existence of other large extensions within the surrounding area does not justify otherwise harmful development elsewhere.
9. I have had regard to the planning permission¹ which has been granted for a single storey side extension, with a pitched roof to replace the existing single storey garage. However, as this would be a single storey extension albeit with the addition of a pitched roof, it is not comparable to the appeal proposal in terms of its bulk and massing. I therefore attribute this very limited weight.
10. My attention has been drawn to a nearby property, 105 Boundary Road (No.105) which was recently granted planning permission² for the demolition of the existing garage/outside toilet, the addition of a two-storey extension, erection of a rear dormer and conversion of the property into three apartments. During my site visit I was able to observe this development, which appeared to have been completed.
11. However, whilst I acknowledge that the proposals are similar in that they both sought to extend the existing property to the side with a two-storey extension, the layout and pattern along Rusper Road (parallel to Hawke Park Road) differs where No.105 is situated. Unlike the appeal site, the other end-terraced properties adjoining Rusper Road either have narrow side projections or sit directly adjacent to the boundary of Rusper Road. It is not therefore directly comparable to the appeal proposal.
12. The appellant has referred me to Policy DM16 of Haringey's Development Management Development Plan Document (the DMDPD) which relates to residential conversions. This policy seeks to maintain a supply of larger family homes within Haringey and sets out a criteria-based approach where the conversion of larger homes to smaller self-contained houses will be supported. Therefore, whilst I acknowledge that the appeal site is located within a 'Family Housing Protection Zone' as identified by this policy, it does not relate to a scheme for the conversion of a larger family-sized home to a smaller self-contained unit. As such, I do not consider this policy to be relevant to the appeal proposal.
13. Nonetheless, I have had regard to the nature of the proposed development which would increase the size of an existing home, providing a three-bedroom flat, which could be suitable for occupation by a family. However, the benefits arising from

¹ Planning Application Ref: HGY/2024/1282

² Planning Application Ref: HGY/2019/2433

this do not outweigh the adverse harm which would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.

14. Consequently, I therefore find that the proposed development would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area. Thus, 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 DMDPD, which seek amongst other things, to ensure development is of a design that respects, responds to, and relates to local context and character.

Other Matters

15. It is not disputed that the proposal would not cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers or to highway safety. I also note that no letters of objection were received. However, these are neutral matters which neither weigh for or against the proposal.

Conclusion

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

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR