



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on Thursday 7 August 2025

by **B J Sims BSc (Hons) CEng MICE MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3365579

49 Queens Avenue, Hornsey, Haringey, London, N10 3PE.

- 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 Milda Baronaite and Mindaugas Lepeska against the decision of Haringey London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2024/3413
 - The development proposed is construction of roof extension incorporating two rear dormers, two rooflights on the rear roof slope and three on the front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for construction of roof extension incorporating two rear dormers, two rooflights on the rear roof slope and three on the front at 49 Queens Avenue, Hornsey, Haringey, London, N10 3PE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2024/3413, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the roof extension hereby permitted shall match or complement those used in the existing building.
 - 3) the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plans Nos 1014/1 and 2, dated August 2024, and 1014/3 and 4, dated October 2024.

Description

2. The description set out above is taken from the decision notice, as best describing the appeal proposal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect the proposed development would have on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, its semi-detached neighbour and the wider street scene, in the context of the surrounding Muswell Hill Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is part of a locally listed building within the southern street frontage of Queens Avenue. This comprises well-preserved Edwardian dwellings of consistent quality and appearance, making a strong contribution to the character and appearance of the Muswell Hill CA.
5. I do not consider that the three front rooflights would harm the front elevation, and otherwise the alterations would not be viewed from the street.
6. At the rear, there is no doubt that the development would radically alter the profile and character of the roof slope with two large dormers and a further two rooflights. However, these changes must be assessed in the context of the rear view of the properties forming this side of Queens Avenue. The neighbouring house at No 47 has an oversized rear dormer and that at No 45, further eastward, has a dormer and balcony. Immediately west, No 51 has a red-painted, upper rear wall surmounted by a full-width dormer. Further west, No 53 has a substantial ground-floor extension, whilst No 55 has a very large two-storey rear extension, also with brickwork elevations.
7. None of these built additions is at all consistent with the original, essentially regular appearance of the rear of this row of buildings, where any true degree of visual harmony has been substantially eroded. I do not consider that, set against these prior adaptations, the roof extension, dormers and rooflights now proposed to No 49 would result in any additional planning harm to the character or appearance of the street.
8. The development would only be seen from private viewpoints behind surrounding dwellings, and I do not consider that it would harm the character or appearance of the Muswell Hill CA as whole, which would accordingly be preserved as required by established planning law.
9. For the reasons explained, I consider the proposal to be compliant with Policies SP11 of the adopted Haringey Local Plan, DM1, 9 and 12 of the Development Management DPD, as well as D3 and HC1 of the London Plan, all of which, consistent with national policy, seek development of high-quality design to protect the historic environment.
10. Thus, having taken into account every point raised in the written representations, I conclude that the proposal complies with the development plan as whole and that this appeal should be allowed and permission granted, subject only to standard conditions, including a requirement for matching or complementary finishing materials.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR