



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/D/25/3366479

19 Stapleton Hall Road, Hornsey, Haringey, London, N4 3QE.

- 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 Stamp against the decision of Haringey London Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/0073.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a second-floor roof extension above existing outrigger and installation of one skylight in the rear main roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a second-floor roof extension above existing outrigger and installation of one skylight in the rear main roof at 19 Stapleton Hall Road, Hornsey, Haringey, London, N4 3QE, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2025/0073, 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 the following approved plans: 01; 02; 03; 04; 05 and 06 - Existing and Proposed Plans, Elevations and Sections, dated 14 January 2025.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect the proposed extension would have on the character and appearance of the appeal property itself, the terrace of which it forms part and the surrounding Stroud Green Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. 19 Stapleton Hall Road is one of a terrace of late Victorian, three-storey town houses with prominent front-facing gables and contrasting red and yellow brickwork construction. The street retains its original form and visual regularity, such that the terrace makes a very positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Stroud Green CA.
4. In contrast, there is great visible variation in the detailed elevations of the rear of the terrace, even disregarding an anomalous addition to No 33. The comparatively

modest, second-floor, mono-pitch extension would project over part of a first-floor outrigger, occupying roughly a quarter of an existing enclosed balcony. This would naturally add to the degree of variation in the appearance of the rear elevation of No 19, and the rest of the terrace. However, the extension would be partly screened by the balcony railings and most clearly seen in side views.

5. Overall, I do not consider that either the proposed extension, or the additional rear roof light, would affect adversely the character or appearance of the terrace, given the modified form of its entire rear elevation.
6. Moreover, the development would not be seen from the street or any public viewpoints and only from the rear of neighbouring properties. In my judgement, therefore, the proposed development would not harm the character or appearance of the Stroud Green CA as a whole which, accordingly, would be preserved, in compliance with established planning law.
7. For these reasons, I regard the proposal as compliant with policies SP11-12 of the adopted Haringey Local Plan and Policies DM1, 9 and 12 of the Development Management DPD, as well as Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan, all of which, consistent with national policy, seek development of high-quality design in order to protect the historic environment.
8. 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