



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2024

by C Livingstone MA(SocSci) (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 March 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/23/3330288

Flat 1, 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 planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Moshe Pinto against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2023/1210
 - The development proposed is a rear first floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in December 2023. As the changes do not materially affect the main issues in this case, the parties have not been invited to make further comments.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. Highgate Conservation Area (CA) includes an attractive mix of varied architecture and open spaces. The significance of the CA is derived in part by a high concentration of unspoilt, high quality architecture. Which includes examples of substantial, finely detailed, Victorian properties. The application site is located in a prominent position on the corner of Cromwell Avenue an attractive residential street and Archway Road which is a busy arterial route and more commercial in nature.
5. The first floor flat at 1 Cromwell Avenue is positioned on the end of a Victorian red brick terrace that fronts on to Archway Road. The properties on the terrace have mono-pitched rear outriggers, that are mirrored with their adjoining neighbour. The topography and pattern of development in the area allow open views of the rear of the appeal property, and the neighbouring properties on the terrace, from Cromwell Avenue. The rear outriggers on the terrace remain relatively unaltered at first floor level, retaining their original symmetry and forming a consistent rhythm of development.
6. The proposed development includes the extension of the rear outrigger to increase its width and height at first floor level, which would be accommodated by a shallower roof pitch. While the outrigger would remain subservient to the

- main body of the property, the increased mass and altered roof pitch would result in the loss of the established symmetry with the attached neighbour.
7. Further, the proposal would result in a deviation of the consistent development formed by the rear outriggers of the terrace which, as detailed above, are visible from Cromwell Avenue which is also in the CA. High quality architecture is a defining feature of the CA. However, the proposed development would result in the erosion of traditional architectural detailing and the introduction of a prominent and incongruous addition to the street scene.
 8. It is acknowledged that the proposal incorporates a palette of external materials to match existing and allows for the retention of original elements including the chimney. Nevertheless, this does not ameliorate the harm I have identified with regard to the overall design of the proposal.
 9. As such the proposal would harm the character, appearance and significance of the CA as a whole. Paragraph 208 of the Framework explains that where, as I find in this case, the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial, that harm should be weighed against the public benefits. The proposed development would provide improved living conditions for the appellant, there may also be economic benefits associated with construction. However, any specific public benefits there may be in this case, would be insufficient to outweigh the great weight I must attach to the harm I have identified to the designated heritage asset.
 10. For the reasons detailed above the character or appearance of the Highgate CA would not be preserved or enhanced as a result of the proposed development. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policy SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013-2026, Policies DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017 and Policies DH2 and DH3 of A Plan for Highgate, Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017. These policies are consistent with the Framework in requiring new development to be of the highest standard of design that respects and conserves its local context, character and historic significance.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Livingstone

INSPECTOR