
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2025

by Robin Buchanan BA (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date 10 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/C/23/3332610

22 Russell Avenue, Wood Green, London N22 6PP

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended (the Act).
- The appeal is made by Mr Guanghui Lin against an enforcement notice issued by the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
- The notice was issued on 5 October 2023.
- The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is 'without planning permission the erection of a porch'.
- The requirements of the notice are to:
 1. Remove front porch extension in its entirety; and
 2. Remove from the property all resultant debris from carrying out requirement 1 above.
- The period for compliance with the requirements is: 9 March 2024.
- The appeal is proceeding on the ground set out in section 174(2)(a) of the Act. Since an appeal has been brought on ground (a), an application for planning permission is deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed; the enforcement notice is upheld as corrected and planning permission is refused.

Preliminary Matter

1. The appellant made fleeting reference to making the porch slightly smaller. Ground (f) was not pleaded in the appeal form and there are no details of an alternative scheme before me. This would be a separate matter for the main parties.

Enforcement Notice

2. It is important that the notice is in order. Section 5 'what you are required to do' also refers to a 'time allowed' period of four (4) months for compliance. Whereas section 6 'time for compliance' gives a date, which has anyway been overtaken by the appeal process. I shall therefore correct the notice in the interests of clarity and certainty without injustice to any party.

Ground (a)

3. Ground (a) is that planning permission ought to be granted for the breach of planning control stated in the notice. This is the erection of a porch (ie as already built).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the porch on the design of No.22 Russell Avenue and in turn on the character and appearance of the Noel Park Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

5. No.22 Russell Avenue is a small, turn of the last century mid-terraced house with a design influenced by the Arts and Crafts movement. This includes a mainly flat, uncluttered façade with quality materials – red brick at ground level with decorated smooth and rough cast cream render first floor and brown tiled, pitched main roof slope above. It is similar in these regards to the majority of houses in this short terrace, a pattern repeated in some similar terraced blocks along this side of this street. As such, these houses are locally distinctive; part of a planned ‘model’ residential Artisan Estate of some 2000 terraced houses developed between 1881 and 1913 that essentially forms the CA¹. Albeit in a relatively modest way, the property nonetheless makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA, which is a designated heritage asset².
6. Amongst other things, the Council is concerned about piecemeal poor quality or insensitive alteration and extension of the houses in the CA, including loss of original features and use of unsympathetic materials such as uPVC. This can damage the homogeneity of the terraces, especially the façades which are most public facing. With this in mind, as well as designating the CA, an Article 4 Direction restricts certain permitted development rights, including to build porches which as a result require an express grant of planning permission.
7. There is variety in terraced house type and design in this part of Russell Avenue and this part of the CA. But in the main, where present, porches are integral to houses as originally built and not significantly altered. Moreover, mostly in brick and either open, recessed below curved arches in the plane of main front elevations or shallow, enclosed projections parallel to front elevations with tiled pitched roofs.
8. The lower part of the porch at No.22 has red brick walls. However, the main upper part is clad in starkly contrasting white horizontal uPVC boarding or panels on all three sides, including white uPVC front door and side windows facing the street, with a dark grey felt or bitumen flat roof. Combined with a wide, deep almost square floorplan this overtly modern cube of built form juts out abruptly beyond the main front elevation of the house.
9. The unsympathetic design, siting, layout and materials mean that the porch lacks visual and physical cohesion with the rest of the house and significantly detracts from important features of it. The intrusive presence of this angular nub does not blend in with the house and renders it manifestly different to most other houses in this terrace and the similar terraces nearby. It jars in the streetscene as an obvious anomaly and is conspicuous as such across mainly open front gardens. Albeit localised, this discordant, incongruous presence is also out of kilter with the prevailing form of other terraced houses nearby in this part of the CA. These negative impacts undermine the integrity of the estate and the look and feel of this part of the CA. Given this fundamental innate incompatibility, planning conditions could not make the porch acceptable.
10. I appreciate that there is a similar ‘uPVC’ front porch at a house in one of the similar adjoining terraced blocks. Although it is smaller and different in detailed

¹ Noel Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan, Haringey Council

² National Planning Policy Framework

design, there is little evidence it has been granted planning permission, has a lawful development certificate or is otherwise immune from enforcement action. In any event, it is not a prevailing form of development in this part of Russell Avenue or the CA, so does not justify the porch at No.22.

11. Taking account of all the above, I find that the porch adversely effects the design of No.22 Russell Avenue. In turn, this causes harm to the significance of this part of the CA, so does not preserve the character or appearance of the CA overall³. I give significant weight to both of these considerations.
12. The porch therefore conflicts with Policies SP11 and SP12 of the Haringey Local Plan Strategic Policies (2013), Policies DM1, DM9, DM12 of the Haringey Development Management DPD (2017) and Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021). These include that residential extensions should be high quality in design and appropriate in form to respect local context, contribute to local distinctiveness and conserve the historic significance of heritage assets. Amongst other things, with regard to preservation of original form, local period architectural style, detailing and matching or complementary materials, including the host building, and cumulative impact.

Heritage Balance

13. The porch has evidently increased accommodation or storage space at the property. It also provides a convenient means of entry and exit to and from this house. While it is no doubt valued by the appellant, there is little to suggest other than that these personal circumstances have limited weight. The private benefits of the porch do not, therefore, outweigh the heritage harm in the wider public interest. Accordingly, the appellant has not demonstrated that the harm to the significance of the CA has a clear and convincing justification.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

14. The porch conflicts with policies of the development plan. Other material considerations do not indicate that ground (a) should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan taken as a whole. Consequently, for the reasons given above, planning permission should not be granted, so ground (a) fails.

Formal Decision

15. It is directed that the enforcement notice is corrected as follows:
 - Section 5 – delete all wording after the end of bullet point 2.
 - Section 6 – delete ‘9 March 2024’ and insert ‘Four (4) months’.
16. Subject to these corrections, the appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld. Planning permission is also refused on the application deemed to have been made under section 177(5) of the Act.

Robin Buchanan
INSPECTOR

³ Section 72(1) - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended)

