



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 April 2025

by **A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/24/3356988

10A Tile Kiln Lane, Hornsey, Haringey, London N6 5LG

- 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 Mrs Katherine Lamb against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/2241.
 - The development proposed is a 3m deep rear extension on the ground floor. Part 3m and part 1m deep rear extension on the first floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey detached dwelling. It is located on Tile Kiln Lane and is part of a pleasant group of contemporary properties of varying designs which utilise similar forms and materials. The appeal site is located within the Highgate Conservation Area (HCA) which is characterised as forming a large area primarily comprising of residential properties with an historic pattern of development with green open spaces and arterial transport routes.
4. Together with the appeal property, due to their design and materials, this group of properties are recognised in the HCA Character Appraisal (2013) as being of good contemporary design. As a collective group, they positively contribute to the character and appearance of the HCA and are reflective of its historic evolution.
5. Similar to its neighbours, the appeal property has a steep, terraced, rear garden that descends towards Archway Road, which is a busy highway forming part of the A1. Due to its elevated position, the rear of the appeal property is visible from Archway Road, however the presence of several trees on the embankment means that such views are restricted when the trees are in leaf. The rear of the site is also visible from the distinctive Archway Bridge, although the views are somewhat restricted by railings and trees.
6. The proposed development is located to the rear of the property and comprises an extension to the ground floor and an extension to the first floor. The Council have raised no objection to the ground floor element and this benefits from an extant

planning permission. Taking this into account, I have no reason to form a different view.

7. Approximately half of the proposed first floor element of the development projects 1 metre from the rear of the property, with the other part projecting 3 metres from the rear of the property. It would have a flat roof and would extend beyond the distinctive overhang of the existing roof of the property, effectively removing the visibility of this feature.
8. The 3-metre projecting element would break through the roof detailing of the ground floor element of the extension, whilst this would be retained as it relates to the 1-metre projecting element. The relationship between these three elements of the extension would be uncomfortable, with the 3-metre projecting element appearing bulky, boxy, and incongruous. The expanse of flat roof at this high level would also contribute to its discordance when considered with the appeal property and its neighbours.
9. I acknowledge that similar materials are proposed to be used, and pleasant box-windows are also proposed. These elements, however, do not overcome the overall harm I have identified. I also acknowledge that views from certain vantage points may be brief for some, however this also does not overcome the harm.
10. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings 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. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the HCA. Due to the scale of the proposal, the harm would be relatively localised, and it would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the HCA. Having regard to paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) there are no public benefits to outweigh the harm, and I apply great weight to the conservation of the HCA in line with Paragraph 212 of the Framework.
11. The development would provide an enlarged living space for the property, however it does not appear that the existing property provides unacceptable living conditions for its occupants, and whilst it would no doubt be a personal benefit to the appellant, I do not consider this to be of a public benefit, in terms of the Framework, and therefore give this limited weight.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the HCA. It would be contrary to Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan (2017) and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017). Collectively, these policies seek to ensure high quality design in developments which conserves heritage assets, and that proposals for alterations to existing buildings in conservation areas should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building.
13. It would also be contrary to policies of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (2017) which require, amongst other things, that rear extensions on residential properties should complement its character in terms of design and detail and should respect and preserve existing architectural features where these contribute to local character and appearance.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR