



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/23/3314877

17 Shepherds Close, Hornsey, London, N6 5AG

- 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 Liam Dooley & Shamita Sharmacharja against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/2219, dated 5 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 26 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is alterations to approved application HGY/2021/0830 'Construction of single storey front and rear extensions, the insertion of a side window and the creation of a side link between the main building and side garage' including revisions to conform with Building Regulation requirements.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to approved application HGY/2021/0830 'Construction of single storey front and rear extensions, the insertion of a side window and the creation of a side link between the main building and side garage' including revisions to conform with Building Regulation requirements at 17 Shepherds Close, Hornsey, London, N6 5AG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2022/2219, dated 5 September 2022, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matter

2. In the interests of clarity, in the banner heading above I have referred to the description of the proposal given by the appellant on the appeal form as this gives a clear description of the type of development proposed which reflects that used by the Council in their decision notice.
3. At the time of my visit, I saw that the development was complete and therefore I am considering this appeal retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. Shepherds Close is a small residential cul-de-sac that branches off and slopes down from Shepherds Hill. Shepherds Hill consists of a relatively wide tree lined road with 3 storey detached double bay houses set behind gardens containing mature trees and bushes. It is these imposing houses and their green setting

that contribute to the character and appearance of the CA close to the appeal site, and its significance, rather than the houses in Shepherds Close which are identified by the Council as negative contributors to the CA.

6. The appeal site is the end property in a terrace of 6 houses at the bottom of the close, adjacent to a group of garages. The terrace comprises pairs of houses of similar height that step down the hill. They are 1960's, 2 storey properties with low pitched roofs, white painted horizontal boards between the ground and second floor and projecting front porches which adjoin those of neighbouring houses.
7. The Council is concerned that the flat roof on the front porch sits higher than that of the adjoining neighbour's porch and thus interrupts the symmetry of the pair of houses, affecting the street scene. Nos 12 and 22 have different porch roof heights to that of their neighbours. Also, some porches have flues projecting from their roofs and others have rooflights of various designs. Furthermore, the colour of front doors and their side panels and those of ground and first floor windows vary throughout the cul-de-sac. As a result, there is enough variation in the appearance of properties within the Close that the development does not look unduly out of place. It does not therefore in my view harm the appearance of the house or the wider area.
8. I do not consider that the lack of white vertical boarding and extent of exposed brickwork around the front extension is excessive and harmful to the appearance of the host property, as suggested by the Council. The colour of the bricks closely matches that of the rest of the house. When approaching the site from the garages below or from further up the hill, the front extension is seen in the context of the large expanse of brickwork on the flank wall of the house opposite. Furthermore, the design resembles that of No 12's, at the other end of the terrace. The officers' delegated report noted that it could be considered that it will add to the symmetry of the end of terrace properties. That is my view, despite the differences in design highlighted by the Council.
9. Overall, I conclude that the development does not harm the character or appearance of the building and area and thus preserves that of the CA. It does not therefore conflict with the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021), Policies D6 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017), Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policy DH2 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) which require high quality development which preserves or enhances the character or appearance of conservation areas.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed. The Council have requested planning conditions in relation to the time limit for the commencement of development and confining the development to specified plans. However, as the proposal is retrospective those conditions are not necessary.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR