



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 August 2023

by Colin Cresswell BSc (Hons) MA, MBA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/23/3320431

29 Milton Park, Hornsey, Haringey, London N6 5QB

- 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 and Mrs Siobhan & John Healy against the decision of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref HGY/2022/2318, dated 18 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 17 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of side kitchen extension to 29 Milton Park and construction of a new three storey plus basement family house on the cleared plot.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr and Mrs Siobhan & John Healy against the London Borough of Haringey. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this case are:
 - whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.
 - whether the proposed development would maintain an acceptable standard of energy efficiency.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal concerns an older style property which is part of the Highgate Conservation Area. The significance of the Conservation Area is mainly derived from the architectural quality of the historic streets and buildings and their physical relationship with each other.
5. The appeal property is a semi-detached dwelling which is situated on the corner of Milton Park and Milton Road. It is architecturally similar to two other pairs of semi-detached dwellings which occupy corner positions in Milton Park. Architectural consistency is also a feature of the surrounding terraced housing. While not every property is identical and some have been subject to modern extensions and alterations, most groups of housing share similar design

features. This provides a sense of uniformity which directly contributes to the quality of the Conservation Area in this location.

6. The appeal property has a modern, single storey side extension which is seen from the corner of the street, together with a paved area which is used for parking cars. According to paragraph 7.4.3 of the Conservation Area Appraisal¹ this creates a 'jarring note'. Yet while these features deviate from the historic design of the property, the original side elevation of the main house remains visible because the modern extension is relatively low. A space is retained between the side elevation of the appeal property and the neighbouring terrace in Milton Road, maintaining a distinct sense of openness. This is visually consistent with the other pairs of semi-detached dwellings which occupy corner positions in this part of Milton Park. Like the appeal property, the side elevations of these dwellings are mainly open and exposed.
7. I am aware of the appellants argument that housing in this area was not built according to a pre-determined design and I have considered the historical information that has been provided to illustrate this point. However, my own observations lead me to conclude that architectural consistency and uniformity are distinguishing features of the present day Conservation Area. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal property makes a direct contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area through its predominantly traditional architecture and the maintenance of an open space between the semi-detached houses in Milton Park and the terrace in Milton Road. These features help to provide a sense of coherence to the surroundings.
8. The proposed dwelling would be taller and wider than the existing single storey extension and would fill most of the open space between the appeal property and No 29 Milton Road. While a small gap would be retained, it would give the appearance of a continuous line of development that would wrap around the corner of the street, effectively merging the terraced housing in Milford Road with the appeal property in Milford Park. This would undermine the prevailing pattern of development in Milton Park where similar pairs of semi-detached dwellings are clearly separated from the terraced housing.
9. Furthermore, the flat roof and relatively low height of the proposed dwelling means that it would appear very different from surrounding properties. Glazed elements to the side of the dwelling and on the roof terrace would contrast sharply with the older style properties that would surround it. This would draw undue attention to the dwelling on a prominent corner site, distracting from the architectural qualities of the street scene in Milford Park and Milford Road. Although the Conservation Area Appraisal supports contemporary buildings, this is only where they are sympathetic to their surroundings.
10. Overall, the proposed development would be a more harmful addition than the existing side extension is. It would undermine the significance of the Conservation Area in this location. Although the harm would be less than substantial, the benefits of the proposal would be entirely private in nature and so would not outweigh the harm I have identified.
11. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

¹ Highgate Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan, December 2013.

There would be conflict with Policies DC3 and HC1 of the London Plan², Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Local Plan³, Policies DM1 and DM9 of the DPD⁴ and Policy DH2 of the Neighbourhood Plan⁵. Together, these policies seek appropriate standards of design and protection of heritage assets.

Energy efficiency

12. It is somewhat unclear from the information provided whether the proposed dwelling would meet all of the requirements set out in Local Plan Policy SP4 relating to energy efficiency. However, the Design and Access Statement goes some way to explaining how energy efficiency would be incorporated in to the proposed design, including a whole life carbon assessment. In my view, this provides adequate evidence that the proposal would be compatible with the overarching objectives of Policy SP4 as well as DPD Policy DM21, which aims for sustainable design. I therefore conclude on this issue that the proposal would maintain an acceptable standard of energy efficiency.

Conclusion

13. The development would be energy efficient and I attach some weight to the benefits of providing a new home. However, these benefits would be relatively modest given the small scale of the development. When considered as a whole, the benefits of the proposal are insufficient to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area that has been identified. In reaching this decision I am mindful of paragraph 199 of the Framework⁶ which says that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, 'great weight' should be given to the asset's conservation.
14. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Cresswell

INSPECTOR

² The London Plan, Mayor of London, March 2021

³ Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 – 2026, March 2013, consolidated with alterations since 2017

⁴ Haringey Development Management DPD Adopted July 2017

⁵ Highgate Neighbourhood Plan Adoption Version 2017

⁶ National Planning Policy Framework.