



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 December 2021

by Martin H Seddon BSc MPhil DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 TH January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/21/3279828

53 Cholmeley Crescent, Hornsey, London N6 5EX

- 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 K Yuri Mikhalev against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref: HGY/2021/1294, dated 19 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 25 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is hipped to gable with rear dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the Highgate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No.53 Cholmeley Crescent is a two-storey semi-detached dwelling located in a residential area. It lies within the Highgate Conservation Area. The conservation area includes Highgate Village, areas of late Georgian and Victorian developments with regular plot sizes and later suburban development with large houses having generous landscaped gardens. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special regard be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas.
4. Cholmeley Crescent is a horseshoe shaped road which is lined by mainly semi-detached houses of distinctive and varying design. No.53 has a hipped roof which complements the form of the large and small gables at its front elevation. The adjoining building of the semi-detached pair, No.55, has a large roof dormer at its front elevation which partly screens views of its hipped roof. The other neighbouring building at No.51 was the subject of construction work at the time of my site visit, including the erection of a side dormer on its roof slope facing the flank elevation of the appeal building.
5. The proposed hip to gable extension at No.53 would add undue mass to the roof and diminish the visible extent of the tall chimney stack when viewed from Cholmeley Crescent. It would fail to appear subservient to the building and would harm its character and appearance. Although the large front dormer at No.55 partly masks its hipped roof, I consider that the proposed gable could

not be justified in terms of balancing the symmetry in appearance of the front elevation of the semi-detached pair.

6. The appellant has advised me of other hip to gable extensions to houses in Cholmeley Crescent and surrounding roads as well as combined hip to gable and full width dormer extensions. However, hipped roofs are a characteristic feature of development in Cholmeley Crescent. The Council indicates that there is no relevant planning history for Nos.65 and 67 Cholmeley Crescent. No.69 was granted permission in 2009 for an extension to an existing mansard and No.71 was granted permission in 2009 for a hip to gable roof extension. In that case No.69 already had a hip to gable extension so the additional gable would have improved the symmetry of the front elevation of the semi-detached pair of houses. I consider that in view of the planning history, and the limited number of hip to gable extensions in Cholmeley Crescent, these examples form insufficient reason to allow the appeal before me.
7. The proposed rear dormer would be set in slightly from each end of the rear elevation of the appeal building. No.55 has a large rear dormer, but that does not combine with a gable roof form as proposed in this appeal. The Council has also advised that there is no planning history for its recent approval and my view therefore it that it should not form a precedent. I consider that the proposed rear dormer would be overly large and harmful to the character and appearance of the rear elevation of the building.
8. I find that the proposed extensions would have a significant harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building contrary to Strategic Local Plan policy SP11 which requires new development to enhance and enrich Haringey's environment. The extensions would conflict with Local Plan policy DM1 concerning high standards of design and Local Plan policy DM9 which requires extensions to buildings in conservation areas to not appear overbearing or intrusive. It would also conflict with policy DH5 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan concerning roof extensions and dormers.
9. The proposed extensions would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, contrary to Strategic Local Plan policy SP12 which seeks to ensure the conservation of Haringey's historic assets and their setting. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework advises 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 public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Even if the proposed extensions were considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the conservation area there would be no public benefits sufficient to outweigh that harm.
10. I have taken all other matters raised into account. However, for the reasons given above the appeal is dismissed.

Martin H Seddon

INSPECTOR