

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2025

by H Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y5420/W/25/3374747

Flat B 300 Archway Road, Hornsey, Haringey, London N6 5AU

- 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 Edwards against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2025/0708.
 - The development proposed is installation of timber framed window and Juliette balcony on first floor rear façade.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site is situated within a conservation area. As a result, in making my decision, I have had special regard to section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. A high proportion of buildings within the Highgate Conservation Area (the CA) are of notable architectural merit, featuring ornate and decorative detailing. Many are residential properties. The CA has a varied and historic street pattern, with some areas displaying a fine-grain, organic form, while others follow a more ordered layout. Its undulating topography creates impressive distant views across London, and its woodland and open spaces contribute to a verdant character. The CA's significance derives principally from its architectural interest. In addition, Highgate's association with several notable historical figures contributes to its historic interest.
5. No 300 Archway Road (No 300) forms a part of a terraced row of traditionally designed properties. No 300 has a red brick-built front elevation addressing Archway Road with contrasting dressings and decorative features in a white finish. Its three front bay windows are topped with a distinctive turret, whilst it is served by a traditionally designed multi-paned entrance door and sash windows. These elements give No. 300 an impressive, distinguished and cohesive frontage, shared by the neighbouring properties of the terrace.

6. At the rear, another turret-topped set of bays within No 300 are readily appreciable from Holmesdale Road, alongside red-brick headers, brick banding, and its balanced approach to window design and apportionment. Therefore, although this side of the property is not the principal one, the architecture and design detailing is nevertheless of high quality. While some properties on Archway Road have been the subject of some rear additions and alterations, like at the front, No 300 and its closest neighbouring properties share very similar architectural detailing and fenestration. Collectively, they present a coherent and largely symmetrical row when viewed from Holmesdale Road.
7. As an architecturally impressive residential building, No. 300 is characteristic of the CA and contributes positively to its significance, irrespective of any change to its locally listed status.
8. The development would introduce an elongated window to the rear elevation of Flat B, inconsistent with the size of other rear windows at No. 300 and at adjacent properties. The base of the window would also sit below an existing red-brick band, unlike other windows that align with this feature, thereby disrupting symmetry. Additionally, the proposed black, multi-spindled balustrade would appear incongruous alongside the multitude of white, unbalustraded windows facing Holmesdale Road. Positioned at first-floor level, the development, and these effects, would be clearly visible from public vantage points on Holmesdale Road.
9. For these reasons, even though the development would utilise traditional materials, it would be unsympathetic to, and harmfully detract from, No 300's distinctive architecture, and it would erode the cohesion and symmetry exhibited by the terrace. Therefore, the development would harm the significance of the CA, failing to preserve its character and appearance.
10. Using the terminology of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the harm to the CA would be less than substantial. Given the scale of the development, and the proportion of the CA which would be affected, the level of harm to the CA as a whole would be low. However, harm would nevertheless arise and, having regard to the relevant statutory duty I set out earlier, this carries considerable importance and weight.
11. The development would improve accommodation within Flat B by enhancing outlook and light. I also have no reason to doubt the appellant's assertion that the development would result in acoustic and thermal efficiency upgrades. However, the public benefits derived from these matters would not be significant enough to outweigh the harm that would result to the CA.
12. For the reasons above, the development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. It therefore conflicts with Policies DM1 and DM9 of Haringey's Development Management DPD, 2017 (the DMDPD) which require developments to achieve a high standard of design and contribute to an area's distinctive character and which require alterations to buildings within conservation areas to be complementary. The development also conflicts with Policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies document 2013-2026 and Policy D6 of the London Plan, 2021 which require developments to be of a high quality of design, which respect local context, character and historic significance, and which seek to conserve the significance of Haringey's heritage assets. Furthermore, the development conflicts with those policies within the

Framework which set out that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance and which emphasise the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets¹.

13. In reaching this conclusion, I have had regard to the other developments within the local area referred to by the appellant. In some cases, I have no substantive evidence that the developments undertaken were authorised. In others, where evidence of permissions are provided, the developments, such as the provision of dormers, differ in character and scale to the appeal proposal, or relate to properties of a different character and appearance to No 300. The appeal scheme has distinct characteristics - its design, site context, and relationship with neighbouring properties - that make its impacts not fully comparable. Accordingly, the examples cited attract limited weight.
14. Finally, the Council's reason for refusal refers to Policy DM2 of the DMDPD. Policy DM2 is entitled 'Accessible and Safe Environments', and it seeks to ensure that developments are accessible, inclusive, safe and secure. As such, this Policy is not relevant to my main issue, and the development does not conflict with it.

Other Matters

15. Amongst other matters, the development would not harm the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. However, the absence of harm in this and other regards is of neutral consequence.

Conclusion

16. I have found that the development conflicts with several policies within the development plan, and I conclude that it conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations which indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

H Jones

INSPECTOR

¹ National Planning Policy Framework paragraphs 202 and 210