The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 October 2015

by G J Rollings BA(Hons) MA(UD) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 9 November 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/15/3129392
146a North View Road, London, N8 7NB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr D Ladjassa against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref HGY/2015/0953, dated 27 March 2015, was refused by notice dated 18 May 2015.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site incorporates a flat located in the first floor of a two-storey, end-of-terrace building. The appeal proposal includes the extension of the existing side-facing hipped roof to form a gable end, and the addition of a rear-facing dormer window partially set within the gable roof extension, to accommodate a new level of accommodation at second-floor level.

4. The building abuts a public laneway along its side edge. There was a moderate amount of pedestrian traffic using this laneway during my visit, with the entrance to Alexandra Park, in the street to the rear of the appeal site, generating most of this use. On its street frontage, the appeal building is mirrored on the opposite side of the laneway by an end-of-terrace dwelling at 144a North View Road. This building has a similar style and proportions to those on the appeal building, and together they form a symmetrical gateway to the laneway.

5. The proposed hip-to-gable roof extension would be clearly visible from the street, and from the rear laneway approach. It would unbalance the existing proportions of the small appeal building and appear top-heavy, and it would appear bulky, despite its proposed front setback. Its obtrusive nature would also be apparent in views of both the appeal building and No. 144a, from the rear laneway approach and from the street frontage, where the existing

symmetry between the buildings would be negatively affected. This discordant relationship would be clearly apparent and would detract from the street scene.

6. I have been advised that there are similar hip-to-gable extensions on other houses in the area, and I saw a small number on my visit. However, these appear to be sparse and such alterations are not representative of the overall character of the area. The examples that I saw did not have similar levels of visibility from public vantage points to the front and rear, or the same detrimental impact on their relationships with neighbouring buildings, compared with the appeal proposal.

7. The appellant notes that the appeal building already has an individual appearance. It is true that the materials and ornamentation on the appeal building differ to those on No. 144a, but the buildings' proportions and other features, such as window sizes and positions and the chamfered corners, are shared between the two dwellings and they can be clearly identified as a matching pair. Although the proposed rear dormer window would be similar in size and style to others that I saw in the area, it could not be built without the hip-to-gable roof extension also. My attention has also been drawn to the fact that were the appeal building used as a single dwellinghouse, rather than flats, then a larger extension would be possible under 'permitted development' rules. Be that as it may, I am determining this appeal on its merits, on the basis of its current use as a flat, and the other evidence before me.

8. I acknowledge that there is some local support for the proposal, and that the works would provide additional accommodation that would improve the current flat and its occupants' living conditions. However, these considerations do not outweigh the concerns that I have set out above.

9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. It would fail to comply with Policy SP11 of the Council's adopted *Haringey Local Plan: Strategic Policies* (2013), *Haringey Unitary Development Plan* (2006) Policy UD3, and the strategic design policies of *The London Plan* (2015). Together, these policies form the Development Plan for the area and require proposals to achieve a high design quality and appropriate proportions and scale, in accordance with local context and character.

Conclusion

10. The proposed development conflicts with the adopted Development Plan for the area, and as such, it is not sustainable development for which the *National Planning Policy Framework* has a presumption in favour. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G J Rollings

INSPECTOR