



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 December 2024

by K Lancaster BA (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10 January 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/24/3349388

89 Hawthorn Road, Hornsey, Haringey, London N8 7LY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr R Bleaney against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/0689.
 - The development proposed is a rear dormer roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Government published a revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) on 12 December 2024. Those parts of the Framework most relevant to this appeal have not been amended. As a result, I have not sought submissions on the revised Framework, and I am satisfied that no party's interests have been prejudiced by taking this approach.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Campsbourne Cottage Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site No. 89 Hawthorn Road is one of a pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings, located close to the junction with Nightingale Lane. The appeal building has a hipped roof, with a front bay that has a gabled roof. In terms of its appearance, it is broadly identical to No.87, but has a small infill extension to the rear of the ground floor.
5. The appeal site is located within the Campsbourne Cottage Conservation Area (the CA) which encompasses the Campsbourne Estate, a very early example of council housing built in the late C19th. The CA predominantly comprises rows of terraced cottage style housing on Nightingale Lane, North View Road, South View Road, Beechwood Road and Hawthorn Road. Its significance is derived from the design and detailing of the houses and the quality of materials and workmanship which give the estate its distinctive character.

6. Hawthorn Road and Beechwood Road comprised the second phase of the estate development. The houses have flat fronts and there are no bays or other projections apart from some porches on the second phase of building.
7. Nos. 87 and 89 Hawthorn Road, together with Nos. 86 and 88 Hawthorn Road are of a different design to the houses which were built as part of the Campsbourne Estate. They are examples of speculative housing built in the early C20th, and which do not follow the cottage style of architecture which is prevalent on Hawthorn Road. Although exhibiting a different character and appearance, the appeal site is nevertheless located within the CA.
8. The proposed development would involve the construction of a rear dormer that would extend from the ridgeline and occupy much of the original rear roof slope. The proposal would also include a number of rooflights within the existing roof slope, including two within the front gable, one between the chimney stacks on the side elevation.
9. In respect of the rear dormer, it would be a large addition to the rear of the property and whilst I accept there would be limited visibility from Hawthorn Road, there would be clear views of the proposed dormer extension from South View Road, where there is a gap between the end terrace of this street and the properties which front onto Nightingale Lane. Although the Council indicates that some dormers have been approved on Hawthorn Road, I observed very few examples of these. The proposed development would disrupt and detract from the undeveloped roofscapes within this part of the CA. As a result, it would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area, and thus would fail to preserve the CA.
10. In respect of the rooflights, the proposal would involve a large number of fairly substantial rooflights being inserted into prominent roof slopes of the building. As a result, the cumulative impact of these would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. I acknowledge the appellant's willingness to omit the two rooflights shown in the front gable. However, this would not overcome my concerns about the proposed development as a whole.
11. The appellant also states that these would comprise permitted development granted under Part 1, Schedule 2, Class C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, as amended. However, it would be for the appellant to apply for a lawful development certificate to demonstrate this, it is not for this appeal to determine whether or not some or all of the proposed development would be permitted development. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.
12. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. This is a matter of considerable importance and weight. For the above reasons, I consider that the proposal would harm and thus fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Furthermore, the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area.
13. With regard to the nature of the proposal and the impact on the significance of the CA, the harm would be less than substantial in the terms of the Framework. In such circumstances, Paragraph 215 requires this harm to be weighed against the public benefits. Whilst the proposal would add a further bedroom to the property to

maximise the available space, and there would be some economic benefits for businesses during its construction, it has not been shown that the benefits from the development would be any more than a private benefit. As such, this would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset to which I must give great weight.

14. Therefore, the proposal would not accord with Policies DM1, DMD9 and DM12 of the DMDPD, and Policies SP11 and SP12 of LP. Collectively, these policies require the design of a development proposal to conserve the significance of heritage assets and the character of the area. Furthermore, it would not accord with the Framework.

Conclusion

15. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations that outweigh the identified harm and that warrant a decision other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

K Lancaster

INSPECTOR