Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 May 2025

by John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/D/25/3362356
64 Sheldon Avenue, Hornsey, Haringey, London N6 4ND

- 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 Naama Fischman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The application Ref is HGY/2024/3377.
- The development proposed is applying render over existing facing brickwork.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for applying render over existing facing brickwork at 64 Sheldon Avenue, Hornsey, Haringey, London N6 4ND in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2024/3377, subject to the following conditions:

   1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.

   2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: Drg Nos 1064(PLA3)000, 1064(PLA3)001, 1064(PLA3)002, 1064(PLA3)003, 1064(PLA3)200, 1064(PLA3)201, 1064(PLA3)202, 1064(PLA3)203, 1064(PLA3)210, 1064(PLA3)211, 1064(PLA3)212 and 1064(PLA3)213.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the Highgate Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a recently constructed two-storey with basement contemporary home built in the Arts and Crafts style with red brick and clay roof tiles. It is located on the northern section of Sheldon Avenue, a long residential street within the Bishops Sub Area of the Highgate Conservation Area (CA). The CA covers a wide area of diverse and varied mix of land uses and buildings including large open spaces, a historic village core, and residential suburban development. The proposal would see the property white rendered on all sides with the red roof tiles retained.

4. The existing dwelling sits comfortable within the pleasant suburban character of Sheldon Avenue comprising a tree lined avenue of largely detached two-storey

dwellings set behind verdant frontages. Many appeared to date from the early part of the last century, especially towards the southern end of Sheldon Avenue. Others appeared as obvious later replacement dwellings of similar style but with some noticeable exceptions of more modern appearance. Whilst red brick and clay tiles were the most prevalent materials, I saw some individual examples peppered along the street where render was the material of choice.

5. The change from red brick to render would significantly alter the appearance of No 64. However, the use of white render would not be alien along Sheldon Avenue, as is recognised by the Council within the officer's report. Some of these examples are dwellings of a different style but that is not exclusively the case, as exemplified by Nos 10, 23 and 39 which have been specifically brought to my attention. Whilst not identical to the appeal property, each of these examples is an individually styled dwelling of traditional appearance. Each demonstrates to me how such a choice of material can complement the architectural style of an individual building without affecting the overall character or appearance of the street scene along Sheldon Avenue.

6. The relationship between No 64 and its neighbours appears no tighter than many others along Sheldon Avenue. The appeal property does not form part of a group that shows any significant degree of cohesion other than through the use of similar materials. For reasons I have already explained, the change to render would not be unique to the area.

7. I fail to see how the use of render would somehow accentuate the perceived scale of the building, which would remain a two-storey dwelling with basement, capped by a clay tiled roof. Suggestions by the Council that the existing building's proportions and detailing are incoherent and would be somehow emphasised by the change in materials are without explanation or supported by any considered analysis. The proportions of the building would not change. I am unable to identify any fault with any of its detailing.

8. I note some concern expressed that the change in materials would contradict a condition that was imposed on the original planning permission requiring the materials that were approved to be maintained in perpetuity. Notwithstanding, I have considered the proposal to use render on its own merits.

9. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposed change to No 64 would sit comfortable within its setting, thereby preserving the character and appearance of the dwelling and the wider street scene. As a consequence, there would be no harm to the CA's significance as a designated heritage asset. For these reasons there would be no conflict with Policies DM1 or DM12 of the Development Management Development Plan Document (DMDPD), adopted in 2017, or with Policy SP11 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2013 - 2026 (LPSP), adopted in 2013, as far as between them they seek to ensure that new development is of the highest quality that respects and contributes to local character. Neither would there be conflict with DMDPD Policy DM9 or LPSP Policy SP12, which between them require development to conserve the significance of heritage assets and specifically for alterations to existing buildings within conservation areas to complement the host building. For the same reasons there would be no conflict with any policies within the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan, adopted in 2017.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time limit condition, a condition requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR