



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 May 2019

by N Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/19/3223962

The Heights, Mount View Road, Hornsey, London, N4 4JU

- 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 Laurie Pearson (Rathgar Property Co Ltd) against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2018/2947, dated 21 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 16 November 2018.
 - The development proposed is roof extension to existing building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant has provided an alternative scheme that I am invited to consider. Appeals should not be used as a means of advancing a development proposal and it does not appear as though that scheme has been consulted on by the Council. Accordingly, I consider that scheme no further.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and the Stroud Green Conservation Area would be acceptable.

Reasons

4. The site contains a four-storey block of flats with a flat roof and is within the Stroud Green Conservation Area. The character of the area is defined by mostly two and three storey Victorian housing, punctuated in places by larger buildings and plots, like the appeal site, of varying architectural quality.
5. The building at the site has a fairly plain appearance and is of a more functional design than the houses around it. It is, however, quite understated, in part, because of its flat roof, and does not draw the eye away from the more decorative and higher quality buildings around it.
6. The appeal proposal would result in an additional storey, with a zinc pitched roof sat behind a parapet, which would be clad with wood. Banding would be introduced between the storeys of the lower floors. The introduction of additional height and mass, together with the use of metal and wooden materials on the building would make it more prominent in the street scene and would emphasise the differences in

- quality between it and the buildings around it. It would, I consider, draw the eye much more than the existing situation.
7. Whilst the pitched roof would only be visible from some angles because of its siting behind the parapet, I consider that where it would be seen, it would result in visual harm being caused because of its design and materiality, which are not characteristic of the area. The use of timber cladding along the parapet would not respond well to materials used in the area and the development would be visible from private areas to the rear of the site as well as from public areas.
 8. The appellant has directed me to another scheme within the Conservation Area where planning permission was granted for a comparable development. I have some, but not all of the details of that case before me. I can see that the proposal there was for a pitched roof across the whole of the roof, rather than one set behind a wooden clad parapet, and in any event, it is some distance from the appeal site and so is not directly comparable. I am not satisfied that the circumstances of that scheme are so similar to this proposal that my overall conclusions on this case should change.
 9. The statutory duty in Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character of a heritage asset is a matter of considerable importance and weight. Given that the building does not make a positive contribution to the character of the area, increasing its scale and prominence and introducing uncharacteristic additions would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the Stroud Green Conservation Area. That harm to the designated heritage asset would be less than substantial, in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework).
 10. Paragraph 196 of the Framework sets out that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.
 11. In this case, the development would make a contribution, albeit a fairly modest one, to local housing supply on a previously developed, small site and it would be in a sustainable and accessible location. In addition to the extra storey to the building, there would be a new wall, gate and refuse store which could be beneficial for occupiers. I do not, however, find that these benefits would outweigh the harm that I have identified.
 12. The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area and on the Stroud Green Conservation would not be acceptable, in conflict with policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan 2017, policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management Development Plan Document 2017 and policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, which seek, in general terms and amongst other requirements, to secure high quality development that preserves or enhances the character and appearance of conservation areas.

N Smith

INSPECTOR