



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 February 2023

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/22/3309714

1 Flat, 1 - Cromwell Avenue, Hornsey, Haringey, London N6 5HN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Moshe Pinto against the decision of London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/1425, dated 17 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 31 August 2022.
 - The development proposed is rear first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Interested parties raised concern that the submitted drawings provided a level of uncertainty regarding the site location as they referred to different addresses. The officers report sets out that the applicant advised that the address relates to Flat 1 located along Cromwell Avenue. At my site visit, I was satisfied that the appeal site relates to Flat 1 located along Cromwell Avenue as shown on the accompanying plans. I have determined the appeal accordingly on this basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, including whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end of terrace dwelling located within a prominent position on the corner where Cromwell Avenue meets Archway Road. The property is readily visible from approaching the site along Archway Road which is a busy commercial/retail street and along Cromwell Avenue which is more residential.
5. The site lies in the CA and I have a duty under 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 or appearance of the CA. I have had regard to paragraph 199 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in terms of giving great weight to the CA's conservation.

6. The CA is noted for its rich history of innovative design and many landmark buildings. It is renowned for its fine mix of Georgian, Victorian, Edwardian, Arts and Crafts and modern architecture.
7. The properties along both Cromwell Avenue and Archway Road exhibit a strong aspect of their original character which is that of a traditional appearance with a broadly consistent materials palette which all make a positive contribution to the CA. The site's significance is derived from its role and collective contribution to the street scene along with other similar properties.
8. The host property is two storeys but steps down to single storey to the rear which comprises a flat roof. The side elevation is exposed being located along the footway on Cromwell Avenue which allows for clear and open views of both the side and rear elevation.
9. The proposed development would be located above the single storey element to the rear and would sit flush with the exposed gable elevation. This, together with the significant height and depth would lead to the side and rear elevation being considerably larger than at present which would be particularly apparent when viewed from along Cromwell Avenue as well as approaches from Archway Road. The combination of the increased size, position at first floor level along with its double pitch roof would dominate the existing property and would appear as an overly prominent and contrived addition. This would result in the proposal not being visually subordinate to the detriment of the host property.
10. I acknowledge the appellant's assertion that the roof profile would be visually homogenous with the roofscape of the host property and the surrounding properties. Whilst double pitch roofs are not uncommon in the locality, this style of roof form in this location would further exacerbate to an unacceptable degree the prominence of the proposed development by appearing as a shed-like addition at first floor level.
11. At my site visit, I saw that the side elevation fronting Cromwell Avenue is consistent with that on the opposite side of the road where it steps down to single storey to the rear comprising a flat roof form. This arrangement gives a sense of openness and spaciousness within the street scene acting as a visual buffer between built development. The introduction of a first-floor rear extension in this space would remove this key feature appearing as inconsistent in the street scene in comparison to adjacent properties whilst detracting from the overall openness of the built form.
12. Whilst the scale, mass and proportions of other properties vary within the locality, and many distinctive features would not be the subject of change such as; the front elevation, highway alignment, thoroughfares, topography, exposed gable, archway road frontage etc, this would not reduce the proposed development's physical visual prominence in this location as it would still be excessive in terms of overall height and depth at this level where the eye would be unacceptably drawn to its presence. The external materials and joinery would match the existing property and other properties. Nevertheless, the incongruity of the proposed development would be highly visible and such factors are therefore a neutral consideration in my overall decision.
13. I note concerns regarding the timber fence at first floor level and I saw the existing timber fence as illustrated on the plans. The existing timber fence would be reduced in length along the side elevation remaining unchanged to

the rear. Given its overall reduction and its low height, the changes proposed to the timber fence would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the immediate area and would have a neutral impact on the CA as a whole. This would not however overcome the other harm I have identified.

14. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property and would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA causing less than substantial harm to its significance as a designated heritage asset. Paragraph 202 of the Framework explains 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. The benefits associated with the scheme are entirely to the benefit of the occupiers by increasing living accommodation at the property. Accordingly, I find that there are no public benefits to offset the identified harm to the CA to which I have attached great weight given the CA's conservation advised by the Framework.
15. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP12 of the Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026, 2017, Policies DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey London Development Management Development Plan Document 2017 which together, amongst other matters, requires extensions or alterations to be of a high design quality whilst ensuring the conservation of the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets, their setting and the wider historic environment. The proposed development would also be contrary to Policies DH2 and DH3 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017, which amongst other things, requires development to preserve or enhance the CA and that rear extensions should be subordinate in scale to the original dwelling.
16. Additionally, the proposed development would not conserve the heritage asset in a manner appropriate to its significance, or positively contribute to local character or distinctiveness in line with the aims of Section 16 of the Framework relating to Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.

Conclusion

17. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination including the provisions of the Framework, that outweighs the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal should therefore be dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR