



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 November 2025

by Elaine Moulton BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3372730

Flat 35, Alford House, Stanhope Road, Hornsey, London N6 5AL

- 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 Tessa Thier against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/0806.
 - The development proposed is to extend current balcony by 1.5 metres to include a raised planter bed and bench seat on the southern side of the balcony for flat 35.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted to extend current balcony by 1.5 metres to include a raised planter bed and bench seat on the southern side of the balcony at Flat 35, Alford House, London N6 5AL in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref HGY/2025/0806, 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 following approved plans: A(OS) 000 Site Location Plan, and A(GA)100 Existing and Proposed Drawings. (Note, all references to East Elevation should be read as West Elevation).

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant states that she did not agree to the change of description that the Council has adopted in its decision notice but, nevertheless, raises no objection to it subject to the reference to 'northern side' being corrected to 'southern side'. I have used the description from the decision notice, making the correction.
3. The appellant has highlighted that the plan reference A(GA)100 Existing and Proposed Drawings, incorrectly refers to the east elevation when it should state west elevation. However, taking into consideration that the plan correctly identifies the south elevation as well as showing the relationship of the site to the adjoining property, in combination with the information contained within the A(OS) 000 Site Location Plan, there is no doubt where on the building the proposed development would take place. Accordingly, I am satisfied that such an error does not undermine my ability to undertake a proper assessment of the scheme.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host building, and whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is within an apartment block which forms one of two blocks known as Alford House. Each of the blocks are similarly designed and have been upwardly extended through the introduction of a penthouse floor.
6. Alford House lies within the Highgate Conservation Area (CA). Consequently, I am required by Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
7. According to the Character Appraisal and Management Plan, the character of the CA is formed by the relationship of its historic pattern of development, its high percentage of buildings of architectural merit, its topography, its green spaces and distant views. Insofar as it relates to the appeal site, the significance of the CA is derived from its cohesive character and fine period architecture.
8. The two blocks of Alford House are more recent additions to the area. They are simply designed with a consistent rhythm and symmetry that ensures that they relate well to each other and to the streetscape of Stanhope Road. As the penthouse floor extension on each block has been set back from all elevations and are enclosed by glazed balustrades, they appear as lightweight additions to the buildings. Accordingly, Alford House makes a neutral contribution to the significance of the CA.
9. The proposed raised planter and integrated bench would be of a comparable height to the glazed balustrade that it would partially replace. It would introduce a hard, solid edge to that part of the building. Nonetheless, as it would only extend along a short section of the south elevation and very little of the west, the penthouse floor would continue to appear as a lightweight and recessive addition to the building. Furthermore, it would be located at the rear of the block, and, due to the adjoining buildings and frontage trees, it would not be readily visible from the public realm.
10. Consequently, it would not adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building or its relationship with the other Alford House block. Additionally, for the same reasons, the character and appearance of the CA would be unharmed.
11. In conclusion, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the host building and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. It would, therefore, accord with policies DM1 and DM9 of the Development Management Plan DPD, July 2017, and Policy D6 of The London Plan, March 2021, which are concerned with design quality and the management of the historic environment.

Conditions

12. I have, in the interests of certainty, attached a condition specifying the approved plans. The wording of the condition corrects the error in respect of the annotation of the west elevation, as referred to in the Preliminary Matters above.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

Elaine Moulton

INSPECTOR