



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2020

**by E Brownless BA (Hons) Solicitor (non-practising)**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: Tuesday, 03 November 2020**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/20/3245727**

**18 Stormont Road, Hornsey, London N6 4NL**

- 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 & Mrs Hann and Octagon Development Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
  - The application Ref: HGY/2019/2876, dated 31 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
  - The development proposed is described as 'demolition of existing wall and erection of a new boundary wall and gates to the roadside boundary of 18 Stormont Road.'
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of existing wall and erection of a new boundary wall and gates to the roadside boundary at 18 Stormont Road, Hornsey, London, N6 4NL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: HGY/2019/2876, dated 31 October 2019, 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 plan: Gates 01 Revision B.
  - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on plan no. Gates 01 Revision B.
  - 4) No works or development above brickwork level shall commence until details of the hedge planting as indicated on plan no. Gates 01 Revision B shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These details shall include the species, size and quantity of all plants to be planted, how they will be planted and protected and the proposed time of planting. The planting shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. Any plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area (the CA). It is characterised by large detached houses and generous sized front gardens. Typically, front gardens include areas of well-maintained soft landscaping with hedging. This gives the area a pleasant and verdant character.
4. At the time of my site visit the host dwelling was under construction. The original boundary wall and extensive hedging along the front boundary, as shown in the appellant's photograph, had been removed. A replacement wall was partially built. Taking everything into account, the appeal site shares a number of key characteristics and therefore makes a positive contribution to the historic character of the CA.
5. The proposed development would extend across the entire width of the front boundary. A comparison with photographic evidence shows that the solid brick element of the proposed wall would be broadly similar to the height and width of the wall it replaced.
6. The proposed wall would have a substantial height ranging between 1.5 to 1.8 metres, approximately. However, the solid brick element would be substantially lower. The inclusion of metal railings to the top of the wall and for the construction of the sliding gates would allow for relatively unobstructed views towards the front garden area and the host dwelling. In my view, visual permeability would be preserved and thus the open character of the streetscene would be retained.
7. Front boundary treatments vary along Stormont Road. By reason of the availability of similar examples of walled front boundaries, metal railings and gates nearby, the proposal would not appear out of keeping in the streetscene.
8. However, the verdant character of the area is derived from the presence of hedging and other mature vegetation along front boundaries or in very close proximity to it. This is part of the established character of the area. Given that there was previously hedging in this position, I find that it is an important part of the scheme to provide for replacement hedging in order to safeguard the verdant character of the area.
9. Overall, the proposed development would fit in well within the streetscene and thus it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. I find no conflict with Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016), Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy DH6 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017). Among other things, these policies seek high quality development that conserves or enhances the significance of the heritage asset.

## Conditions

10. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary in the interests of clarity to define the plan which the scheme should accord to. A condition concerning external materials and the details of hedging is required in the interests of character and appearance of the area.

## **Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons, the appeal is allowed subject to the conditions.

*E Brownless*

INSPECTOR