



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3374096

4 Millfield Lane, Camden, London N6 6JD

- 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 Daniel Straus against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2025/3182/P.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a part single-storey, part first-floor side extension, alongside the replacement of the existing boundary treatments with a solid brick wall and integrated planting.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a part single-storey, part first-floor side extension, alongside the replacement of the existing boundary treatments with a solid brick wall and integrated planting at 4 Millfield Lane, Camden, London N6 6JD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/3182/P, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one end of a terrace of 4-storey neo-Georgian houses which feature garages at street level and a prominent slate-clad mansard. The terrace is set back from the street with the garages and forecourt partly screened by raised beds and access gained to the houses' front doors via steps.
4. The appeal property was extended to the side at ground floor level following a grant of planning permission in 2014. This extension is largely hidden in views from the street due to the tall boundaries to the front and side of the appeal site and the landscaped area at the front of this part of the site, which includes 3 mature trees and shrubs. To the side of the site there is a narrow lane beyond which a new house has recently been constructed. The main massing of this contemporary flat-roofed dwelling is set back behind the building line of the terrace whilst a single-storey element protrudes forward towards the street.

5. Millfield Lane is within a section of the Highgate Conservation Area (CA) on the south-west facing slope of Highgate Hill which is bounded by Hampstead Heath on one side and Highgate West Hill on the other. The parts of Millfield Lane adjacent to the Heath have a rural feel whilst the immediate surroundings of the appeal site are more suburban in character featuring largely 20th century development. The terrace of which the appeal property forms part makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
6. Planning permission was granted in September 2025¹ for the erection of a single storey side extension, alterations to the rear ground floor fenestration and the replacement of boundaries. This scheme would replace the existing ground floor extension with an extension that would occupy almost the entirety of the space to the side of the house and would include the erection of tall brick walls to the front and side of the site. I consider there to be a high likelihood that this scheme would be constructed should this appeal be dismissed and therefore view the approved scheme as a fall-back position to which significant weight must be attached.
7. The appeal proposal would comprise the replacement of the existing side extension with a 2-storey addition. The ground floor part would extend to the side boundary of the site with an enclosed patio space provided at the front. The upper floor would have a smaller footprint and would be set away from the side elevation of the host building with a glazed link provided between the existing and proposed first floor levels. The upper part would comprise hit and miss brickwork and both elements would have planted flat roofs. A new boundary wall would be constructed at the front of the site that would feature an evergreen hedge above – a feature that forms part of the fall-back scheme.
8. The first floor element would be largely screened by the trees to the front of the site and during winter months it would be seen in the context of the rather bland flank wall of the host property and the neighbouring contemporary house. It will be set apart from the terrace, by virtue of the set-back glazed link, and from the new house due to the lane between the two properties. It would therefore read as a stand-alone element in the street scene and would be subservient in respect of its size and presence to the buildings to either side.
9. The spacing between the proposal and the neighbouring buildings would not be out of character with this part of Millfield Lane which includes closely spaced buildings and terraces. Whilst the proposal would partly obscure views towards the mature trees at the rear of the appeal site this would not result in material harm to the verdant character of the CA, which is largely derived from the parts of Millfield Lane that border the Heath.
10. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It therefore accords with Policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development respects local context and preserves or enhances heritage assets. There is also compliance with Policies DH2 and DH4 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan which require the same.

¹ Application ref: 2025/3181/P

Conditions

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition requiring the approved development to be carried out in accordance with the approved drawings is imposed. The appearance of the external and boundary walls of the proposal and the provision of green roofs and planting are key aspects of the proposal. Conditions requiring the submission and approval of details of these matters are therefore necessary to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

S Poole

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 following approved plans: EX-98; EX-99; EX-100; EX-101; EX-102; EX-200; EX-201; EX-202; EX-203; PR-99-A; PR-100-A; PR-101-A; PR-102; PR-200-A; PR-201-A; PR-202-A; PR-203-A; PR- 204; PR-205.
- 3) No development above ground level shall take place until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted, and for the boundary walls, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.
- 4) No development above ground level shall take place until full details of the living roof and boundary planting have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The details shall include:
 - i. a detailed scheme of maintenance;
 - ii. sections at a scale of 1:20 with manufacturer's details demonstrating the construction and materials used; and
 - iii. full details of planting species and density.

The living roof and boundary planting shall be fully provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation and thereafter retained and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.