



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2025

by **J Smith MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3360956

122, 124, 124A Crouch Hill, London N8 9DY

- 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 Anna Mayers against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/2012.
 - The development proposed is part demolition of the existing 3 storey terrace of 3 dwellings, construction of mansard roof extension and associated works to provide a new 4 storey terrace of 3 dwellings, including a single storey side extension to no. 124a.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The proposal concerns the setting of a listed building which is also located within a conservation area. I have therefore had special regard to Section 66(1) and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issues

3. It follows that the main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Crouch End Conservation Area; and,
 - the effect of the proposal on the setting of the Grade II listed No. 120 Crouch Hill.

Reasons

Conservation area

4. The appeal site is located within the Crouch End Conservation Area (CA). The CA is centred on its suburban town centre. This centre hosts a strong feature of community and commercial buildings within its core. These include a town hall, public houses and shopping parades. The built form in this area of the CA is of typically taller and concentrated forms than the buildings located to its periphery. Towards the periphery, buildings are sited in a less densely developed layout and are typically utilised as residential dwellings. Overall, the CA takes its significance from its layout of its streets which promotes an increase in building height towards the town centre.
5. The appeal site comprises a row of three, two storey terraced dwellings with living accommodation within their mansard roofs. The properties which make up the

appeal site subtly host a transition in height from 118 Crouch Hill, towards the direction of the taller buildings which make up the core of the CA. Despite this role, due to their lower height and unassuming nature, this terraced row is not immediately noticeable in this otherwise busy area of Crouch Hill. As such, I therefore find that the existing terrace makes a neutral contribution to the CA.

6. The proposal would create a four-storey terrace. It would incorporate an additional full complete floor in place of its existing mansard roof, with a change in its character to a flat roof at the fourth storey. When viewed from positions within the CA, this would appear as a jarring change which would disrupt the delicate transition in height from No.118 Crouch Hill to the core of the CA through its addition of mass and height which would be much greater than its neighbours. The provision of angled solar panels would further increase the height of the building when viewed from Crouch Hill.
7. Furthermore, the existing street facing elevation hosts dividing brick detail between each terrace. This would be lost through the creation of an expressionless, tall white rendered elevation. This absence of detail, along with its greater massing and height, would further produce a building of a significant mass, with little to break up its appearance. When all of these design considerations are taken into account, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of this part of the CA.
8. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017 (LP), and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD 2017 (DPD). These policies seek for development proposals to respond to local distinctiveness, respond to the existing character of a place by identifying the special and valued features in that locality and be sympathetic to and ensure the conservation of a heritage assets' significance, amongst other things.

Setting of a listed building

9. No. 120 Crouch Hill is a Grade II listed building which is located immediately next to the appeal site. According to the official list entry, the listed building dates from the 19th century and is a two storey, three bay villa of brick which has subsequently been painted white. It has a low pitched, hipped, slate roof with a doorway in a central position below a swept copper roof porch. During my site visit, I noted that the setback position of the building allows for an appreciation of its architecture and landscaped front garden setting. Its significance is therefore derived from its retained architectural form and setting.
10. The appeal site contributes to the setting of the listed building due to its relative height and similar setback from the highway. This allows for the listed building to be experienced and appreciated without competition from the terraced row of No. 122-124A.
11. Similarly, for the reasons set out in the first main issue, the proposal would harm the setting of the listed building. The front elevation would create a terraced row of a significant height with little detail to break up its lack of expression. This, in combination with the provision of visible angled solar panels to its roof would create a substantial building which would conflict with the subtlety of No. 120 Crouch Hill and its setting. The provision of vegetation between the listed building

and the appeal site would not mitigate this harm due to the difference in height when viewed from Crouch Hill.

12. Altogether, these elements of the proposal would appear alien and conflicting, therefore creating a building with a dominant modern appearance at a close distance to the listed building. The proposal would harmfully change the experience and view of the listed building when viewed from Crouch Hill. This would not preserve the setting of the listed building.
13. To conclude, the proposal would conflict with Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021, Policies SP11 and SP12 of the LP and Policies DM1, DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management DPD. Amongst other things, these policies seek to sustain and enhance the significance of a heritage asset and its setting, conserve the historic significance of Haringey's heritage assets and relate positively to neighbouring structures, amongst other things.

Other Matters

14. The appellant has suggested that if I were to find harm with the proposal, several planning conditions could be utilised to amend its design or certain elements of the scheme. These possible changes are noted on a sketched drawing which was provided during the appeal. The Planning Practice Guidance makes it clear that it would not be appropriate to utilise conditions to modify the development in a way that makes it substantially different from that set out in the application.
15. An example of a development at Coolhurst Road is cited. This example is absent of a decision notice, officer report or application plans. I am therefore unable to ascertain the reasoning behind this decision. Nevertheless, I was able to visit this example during my site visit. Whilst this is located within the CA, there are notable differences in the character of this particular area of the CA. These include the overall similar height of the buildings and the relationship between the buildings which make up this street scene. I therefore ascribe limited weight to this example.
16. The appellant notes that changes to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO) are under consultation. It is also contended that outside of a conservation area, the works proposed would be permitted under the GPDO. However, the appeal site is within a conservation area. The application was submitted as a full application, not as a certificate of lawfulness under the provisions of the GPDO and therefore I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Planning Balance

17. The harm to the setting and thus significance of No.120 Crouch Hill and the CA as a result of the proposed development would be less than substantial in the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Paragraph 215 of the Framework notes that where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
18. The proposal would make an efficient use of previously developed land within an urban area which is close to several modes of public transport. It would also result in local construction employment and its future occupiers would use local shops and services and generate council tax receipts. The changes to the terraced row

would lead to a more energy efficient building which would also create its own energy through the utilisation of solar panels in particular. I attach moderate weight to these above benefits.

19. The appellant suggests that the proposal would create a greater living standard per dwelling. This would be a private benefit to the occupiers of these dwellings and therefore, this would not be a public benefit. There would also be no loss to family housing. The application site is located within Haringey's Family Housing Protection Zone which encourages the retention and improvement of family housing. Therefore, I consider this to be an absence of harm.
20. The Framework makes clear that great weight should be given to a heritage assets conservation. Overall, the public benefits taken together do not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed building or the CA. Given the absence of any significant public benefit, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the setting of the Grade II listed No.120 Crouch Hill and the character or appearance of the CA. The scheme thereby conflicts with the approach to heritage assets in section 16 of the Framework. Consequently, the Framework does not indicate in favour of the scheme.
21. Furthermore, I consider that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. Material considerations do not outweigh the conflict with the development plan. A decision should therefore be taken in accordance with the development plan.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

J Smith

INSPECTOR