The Planning Inspectorate

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2016

**by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 16 January 2017**

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/16/3159348**
**489 Seven Sisters Road, Tottenham, London N15 6EP**

- 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 Turabi Keskin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref HGY/2016/1800, dated 31 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 25 August 2016.
- The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension to first floor flat and rear dormer window extension to second floor flat

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. I have described the proposed development as such above as there was no commonality between the descriptions on the planning application form, appeal form or the Council's decision notice. I have sought the views of both parties and no objections have been raised. I have therefore determined the appeal on this basis.

## Application for costs

3. An application for costs was made by Mr Turabi Keskin against The London Borough of Haringey. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

## Main Issues

4. There are two main issues. These are the effect of the development on a) the character and appearance of the building and the area and b) the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings with specific regard to outlook and whether or not it would be overbearing.

## Reasons

*Character and Appearance*

5. The appeal site is one of a row of three storey terraced buildings predominantly of a mixed use with commercial units to the ground floors and residential accommodation above. There is a defined pattern to both the gable roof shape and elevation of the upper floors when viewed from the front which is repeated throughout the terrace. Whilst the rear elevations have been much altered, the

characteristic repeating even rhythm of the valley roof shape, which extends to a hip at the rear, remains very much intact.

6. Due to the height of the building and front gable detailing the proposed dormer would not be appreciable from Seven Sisters Road. It would however be highly visible in the street scene to the rear of the terrace, which presents to Pulford Road. The proposed dormer would all but obliterate the characteristic design detail of the hipped roof and owing to its size and design it would appear as a bulky and incongruous feature which would interrupt the repeating pattern of roofs in the terrace.

7. The evidence before me suggests that the dormer in the roof of Number 517 Seven Sisters Road is an historic addition. It is clearly of poor design and an inappropriate scale relative to the roof. It therefore causes harm to the building and the wider area. The proposed dormer in this case would be very similar and would thus cause additional harm as well as, and not instead of the one on 517. Its existence is not therefore sufficient to justify the proposed dormer.

8. I have no doubt that a number of loft conversions have taken place in the roof spaces of buildings in the terrace including what is a lawful dormer in No 525. The dormer in this case is however more than marginally smaller than the proposed and contained partially within the existing roof slope. It is not therefore directly comparable to the proposed, thus again not sufficient to justify it.

9. The proposed first floor extension would project from the existing rear wall to enlarge the first floor flat. It would in effect be single storey, have a flat roof and be erected atop an existing flat roof rear extension on the ground floor.

10. Given that this extension would also be to the rear, there would be no views of it from Seven Sisters Road and as it would be lower down the rear elevation, it would not be as immediately obvious in the street scene of Pulford Road as a substantial change to the roof.

11. Nevertheless, the extension would not reflect the design; form or detailing of the original building and through emulating later additions would fail to represent an example of design that is of sufficient quality. The extension would appear bulky and unbalance the rear elevation through being to one side. Even though it would have a very limited overall visual effect, this would not be sufficient to justify it. It would therefore add to the harm that I have explained above.

12. The proposed development would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of both the existing building and the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan[1], Policies CS1 and CS5 of the Core Strategy[2], Policy DM01 of the Local Plan[3] and the guidance contained in the Residential Design Guidance SPD[4].

13. These Policies and additional guidance seek to ensure that, amongst other things and along with section 7 of the Framework[5], new development is of a

[1] The London Plan 2015
[2] Barnet's Local Plan Core Strategy Development Plan Document 2012
[3] Barnet's Local Plan Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2012
[4] Local Plan Supplementary Planning Document Residential Design Guidance 2013
[5] The National Planning Policy Framework 2012

high quality and contextually appropriate design and appearance and respects local character.

*Living Conditions*

14. The proposed first floor extension would project to the rear of the existing building, directly adjacent to the shared boundary with the neighbouring flat to the north east. There are two windows in the rear elevation of the neighbouring flat, the closest to the boundary would have its outlook and light constrained to an unacceptable degree by the proximity and extent of projection of the first floor extension. The overbearing and enclosing effect that the extension would have on this window would be exacerbated by the blank and featureless nature of its design.

15. Whilst I have not been provided with any evidence as to the precise use of the room that would be affected, the window is one of only two on the rear elevation related to the floor they serve. The only other outlook and source of natural light to the remainder of the same floor being from the triple pane window to the front.

16. I accept that in isolation the proposed dormer window would not have any adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers but this would not be so for the first floor extension, for the reasons set out above. As such, it would conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, Policy DM01 of the Local Plan and the guidance contained in the Residential Design Guidance SPD. These Policies and additional guidance seek to ensure, amongst other things and along with one of the core principles of the Framework, a high quality environment and good standard of amenity for existing and future occupiers of land and buildings.

**Other Matters**

17. I acknowledge the appellant's comment that the proposed flats would comply with the relevant space standards but this is neither a contentious matter in the determination of the appeal or sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified above.

**Conclusion**

18. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

*John Morrison*

INSPECTOR