
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 April 2025 by J Kirkaldy BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/25/3361967

143A Durnsford Road, London, N11 2EL

- 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 Ahtasham Ali against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/3573.
 - The development proposed is roof extension to existing 2 bedroom bungalow to facilitate changes to internal layout with associated alterations to exterior treatment of building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Preliminary Matters

3. I note there is a discrepancy between the original description of the development as shown on the planning application form and that used by the Council on the decision notice. Whilst I am satisfied that both are seeking to describe the same proposed development, I have taken the description of the development in the banner heading above from the Council's decision notice, as it provides a more concise description of the proposal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is located to the rear of 143 Durnsford Road, a property which has been converted into a dental practice on the ground floor with residential accommodation above. Along this section of Durnsford Road, a number of the semi-detached properties have single storey outbuildings with low profile roofs in the rear gardens.
6. The appeal site itself comprises of a former outbuilding associated with no.143 which was granted a certificate of lawfulness for use as a separate residential dwelling in 2010. The appeal dwelling has no street frontage, with access gained

through the pedestrian gate to the side of 143 Durnsford Road. Planting to the front of the dwelling provides a degree of privacy and screening from the rear elevation of no.143. The appeal dwelling currently has a utilitarian appearance but given the single storey height and flat roof it appears discrete and unobtrusive within the wider setting. Despite its residential use, the property still appears as an ancillary outbuilding within a domestic rear garden.

7. To the rear of the appeal site along Sakura Drive is a row of eight dwellings of contemporary appearance with distinctive half flat/half pitched roofs partially rendered and clad in weatherboard. The appeal dwelling is partially visible from the vehicle turning area towards the end of Sakura Drive and is positioned at an oblique angle to this street scene. It is separated by close boarded fencing and the intervening communal amenity space associated with the three-storey flatted development to the rear.
8. The proposed replacement roof would mimic the half flat/half pitched roofs of Sakura Drive to provide increased height and additional accommodation at first floor level. Whilst the proposed development would have limited visual effect on the street scene of Durnsford Road given its position in the rear garden, it would be a highly visible development from the neighbouring residential gardens and from the rear of the appeal site, along Sakura Drive and the three-storey flatted development.
9. The proposed increase in height would create a two-storey building within a rear garden setting eroding the subservient visual relationship with no.143. The additional bulk and mass at first floor level would appear as an alien and conspicuous feature within this context. It would also appear incongruous with the other nearby neighbouring dwellings along Durnsford Road and their associated subservient outbuildings in the rear gardens and would harm the spatial pattern of the surrounding built form.
10. I recognise that the proposed development would be visible from Sakura Drive above the existing fencing, albeit would not have any street frontage. However, it would not be perceived as part of the development along Sakura Drive due to the boundary fencing and the communal amenity space for the flats which create a physical separation. Instead, it would visually appear as a separate and non-related dwelling.
11. For the reasons given, I find that the proposal would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with Policy DM1 of the Haringey Development Management DPD, Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies and the London Plan which seek to secure high quality developments, that respect local character and appearance of the area and relate positively to neighbouring structures.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to other developments in the vicinity. However, those referred to are of a different context to the appeal scheme and are not therefore directly comparable to the appeal proposal which I have determined on its own merits.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Kirkaldy

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR