The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 December 2016

by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/16/3161146
44 Twyford Avenue, Hornsey, London N2 9NL

- 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 Mrs Maria Christodoulou against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref HGY/2016/1981, dated 14 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2016.
- The development proposed is an extension of the hipped roof over the existing side extension, the formation of a rear dormer to facilitate a loft conversion, the insertion of 2no roof windows in the front roof slope and the conversion of the garage into a habitable room.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension of the hipped roof over the existing side extension, the formation of a rear dormer to facilitate a loft conversion, the insertion of 2no roof windows in the front roof slope and the conversion of the garage into a habitable room at 44 Twyford Avenue, Hornsey, London N2 9NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2016/1981, dated 14 June 2016, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site Location Plan; AP(00)02 Rev A; AP(00)03 Rev A; AP(00)04 Rev A; AP(00)05 Rev E; AP(00)06 Rev E; AP(00)07 Rev E; AP(00)08 Rev C.

   3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extensions hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing house.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect that the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms the left hand half of a pair of two-storey semi-detached houses. This building is typical of the development in this part of Twyford Avenue, particularly to its southern side; the street scene of which is generally characterised by evenly spaced pairs of semis that are consistently

aligned. Many of the properties appear to have been extended and altered in a variety of ways. Nonetheless, the characteristics described above combine to give the street a fairly strong rhythm and pleasant feel.

4. While the extension would enlarge the built form of the host house, particularly the roof form, within the context of the mass of the greater building, it would not appear as an over-large addition. Moreover, the principal portion of the additional roof form would be set back thereby limiting its potential visual effect on the street scene and host building. The pitch of the front, rear and side-hip planes of each aspect of the extended roof would also respect the form of the existing roof, such that it would not have a significant effect on the overall balance of the pair when viewed from the street.

5. I note the evidence regarding other proposals in the area, including those at 42, 40 and 38 Twyford Avenue. Each planning application and appeal must be determined on its individual merits and I am not aware of all of the circumstances of those other cases. Nonetheless, I did observe the extension to No 40 when I conducted my site visit. While different, it appeared to me to feature similar characteristics to the appeal scheme. Although, for the foregoing reasons, it does not set any kind of precedent, it does offer an indication that development along these lines is able to proceed without have a materially detrimental effect on the host building or wider street scene. Consequently, that extension goes some way to supporting my assessment of the potential effect of the appeal development as outlined above.

6. For these reasons, therefore, the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area. Consequently, in that regard, it would not conflict with London Plan 2015 Policies 7.4 and 7.6, Haringey Local Plan 2013 Policy SP11, Haringey Unitary Development Plan 2006 Policy UD3 and Policy DM1 of the Pre-Submission Version of the Development Management DPD January 2016.

Other Matters

7. I note the appellant's comments regarding the Council's conduct during the planning application process. However, that is of no relevance to the determination of this appeal such that it has had no bearing on my decision.

Conditions and Conclusion

8. In addition to the standard time limit condition the Council has requested two conditions, which I have considered in the light of government guidance on the use of conditions in planning permissions. To provide certainty, a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans would be necessary. A condition to control the details of the facing materials of the extension would also be necessary to ensure it harmonises with its context.

9. For all of the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should, subject to the identified conditions, be allowed.

G D Jones

INSPECTOR