



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 April 2025

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/25/3360088

196 Seaford Road, Tottenham, London N15 5DS

- 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. Weiss against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/3415.
 - The development proposed is installation of front basement stairway and new door in association with enlarged front lightwell.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my site visit, I saw that the development was in situ. The application has been submitted retrospectively; I have dealt with the appeal on this basis.
3. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted an amended description in the heading above.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area and host property.

Reasons

5. The site is located within a predominantly residential area, the appeal property is visually a two-storey mid-terraced residential property. The area is characterised by harmonious design features including projecting bay windows and modest sized front amenity space. Whilst some properties in the area have been altered or extended there is an architectural rhythm to the streetscene.
6. Front boundary treatments vary in terms of material however they have a uniformity in terms of being low level allowing views into the front amenity space of properties. Basement lightwells and associated staircases are not a common feature in the area.

7. A basement lightwell has been previously approved by the Council¹, this lightwell did not have an external staircase. The development before me is larger, a different shape, includes an external basement door, staircase and balustrade which is significant different to the previously approved development.
8. I observed from my site visit that the metal staircase is visible from multiple public vantage points within the street. The presence of the metal staircase, balustrade and gate is an incongruous addition to the traditional façade of the property. The modest front amenity space has been eroded and the larger lightwell with its associated structures is unsympathetic to the built form of the area.
9. I find that the development would harm the character and appearance of the area and host property.
10. There is conflict with Policy SP11 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026 (2013, consolidated with alterations since 2017), Policies DM1, DM12 and DM18 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) which amongst other things seeks to create a strong sense of place and achieve high quality design appropriate to the local context.
11. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) which seeks to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to other developments approved by the Council. I have been provided with limited details to compare these to the proposal before me. Notwithstanding this each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
13. The appellant highlights that the Fire Risk Assessment Report (December 2024) confirms that an external means of escape is necessary for compliance with fire regulations and ensuring a safe secondary exit. Whilst the report confirms that an external stairwell was added to the basement, I have not been provided with substantive evidence to demonstrate that a fire escape is necessary for this single-family dwelling to comply with fire regulations or that the proposal before me is the only way to accommodate a means of escape, as such I give this limited weight.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR

¹ Ref: HGY/2022/1963