



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2024

by Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 December 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/24/3345567

129 Castlewood Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N15 6BD

- 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 S Ollech against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey Council.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/0584.
 - The development proposed is a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a first floor rear extension at 129 Castlewood Road, Tottenham, Haringey, London N15 6BD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2024/0584, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P01, P02, P03 and P04.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr S Ollech against the London Borough Of Haringey Council and this is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area; and
 - The living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal dwelling is a two storey mid-terrace house that has been the subject of a large rear dormer extension and a full width single storey ground

- floor extension. It forms part of a terrace and area where similar terraced properties have undergone significant extensions of varying design and scale.
5. The appeal dwelling and terrace of which it forms part is located within the area covered by the House Extensions in South Tottenham Supplementary Planning Document (2013) (the SPD). This provides design guidance for extensions intended to meet the need to provide for additional habitable accommodation for large families in South Tottenham.
 6. The appeal proposal is for a full width single storey first floor flat roofed rear extension that would sit above the existing ground floor rear extension, and at 1.8 metres deep would be approximately half its depth. Given the flat roof of the existing dormer and ground floor extensions, the proposal would result in the rear of the appeal dwelling having a stepped appearance.
 7. The design of the proposed extension does not reflect the design guidance for 3 types of extensions illustrated in the SPD, which it states would be regarded as acceptable in principle. Whilst generally discouraging 2 storey or higher rear extension, the SPD is design advice and does not mean that other types, scale and designs of extension that meet the need for accommodation for larger families would not be possible. Such advice should be considered with regard to the individual context and the SPD does affirm that each planning application will be considered on its individual merits. Although adopted after the publication of the SPD, Policy DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) sets out that proposals for residential extensions should have regard to the SPD.
 8. After the adoption of the SPD the Council approved applications¹ for similar rear extension at 123 and 135 Castlewood Road (No. 123 and No. 135). The approved extension to No. 135 appears to not have been implemented, and No. 123 has been the subject of a recent substantial development to form a three storey property, and it is not clear from the material submitted for the purposes of this appeal whether the earlier approved rear extension at No.123 was implemented. As the built effect of these older approvals is not available for me to assess, I have, therefore only afforded these previous approvals moderate weight in my considerations.
 9. However, there are significant extensions at 133 Castlewood Road and to other properties in the terrace of which the appeal property forms part, including first floor flat roofed rear extension very similar to that proposed. This results in the terrace of which the appeal dwelling forms part and the local area having a varied scale, with many different design details and materials, including some having a flat roofed stepped appearance similar to that proposed. This also results in a varied and inconsistent rear building line.
 10. I note that both the appellant and council have made mention of the Council having an informal and unwritten protocol that they have shared with the local community, which suggests that 2 rear storey extensions up to half the width of the property, of modest depth and built in tandem with an extension to an attached neighbouring property may be acceptable. As this advice is unwritten and informal, I can only regard this as pre-application advice given by officers in good faith, which suggests that 2 storey rear extensions could be acceptable

¹ Planning Ref: HGY/2014/2496 & HGY/2014/2496

in certain circumstances and can only afford this limited weight in my considerations.

11. The varied scale and design of extensions to properties in the terrace and local area that intended to provide additional accommodation for larger families, particularly to the rear, results in a diverse streetscape and rear building line. Within this context the proposal would appear to reflect that variety, without appearing as uncharacteristic or incongruous in relation to the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part or that of the local area.

Living Conditions

12. The proposed full width first floor rear extension would extend approximately 1.8 metres from the original rear wall of the rear of the appeal dwelling. Given the distance of first floor windows of adjoining neighbouring dwellings to the boundary with the appeal dwelling, I do not find that the proposed rearward 1.8 metre extent of the proposal would be so great that it would result in any significant sense of enclosure for the occupiers of these dwellings.
13. Similarly, I find that, as a result of the relatively modest 1.8 metre depth of the proposed extension and the distance between it and the rear windows of neighbouring adjoining dwellings, the proposal would not result in any significant loss of daylight and sunlight to the rooms that these windows serve.
14. For the reasons given above, I do not find that the proposal would result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling, the terrace of which it forms part and that of the local area or result in any significant harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers. As such the proposal would comply with Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies Document 2013 – 2026 (2017), Policies DM1 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017), Policies D3 and D6 of the London Plan (2021) and Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023). Collectively these seek development, including extensions, which relate to positively to neighbouring structures and building lines, ensure the quality and character of places and maintain a high standard of amenity for neighbouring occupiers.

Conditions

15. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality that require compliance with the approved drawings and materials that match existing.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR