



Officer Report

Application Number:	HGY/2026/0759
Application Type:	Householder planning permission
Address:	4 Sheldon Avenue, Hornsey, London, N6 4JT
Proposal:	Demolition of side garage and erection of a single storey side extension.
Case Officer:	Mark Chan
Valid Date:	18/03/2026
Applicant:	Mr Robert Murad
Agent:	Mr Paul Broderick

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse

1. SITE DESCRIPTION

The application site is a two-storey, detached dwellinghouse on the eastern side of Sheldon Avenue. The property is located within the Highgate conservation area – Bishops subarea but is not in the vicinity of a listed building.

The significance of the Bishops subarea derives from its development as a suburban extension to the original settlement of Highgate village, although in a form which is in direct contrast to the higher density, late-Victorian suburban development to the east of the historic village. From the outset, the type of housing created was intended for a wealthy clientele and this is reflected in the lower density of development consisting of large, detached houses contained within individual plots, with generously sized gardens. The original buildings on the road adopted the English Domestic (or Vernacular) revival, influenced by the Arts-and-Crafts movement. The suburban character of the architecture was complemented by the setting of wide roads with large front gardens and generous tree planting, all contributing to the distinctive character and appearance of the townscape.

The southern half of Sheldon Avenue, between Hampstead Lane and Denewood Road, was developed by Walter Quennell mainly from the early 1920s. No. 4 remains predominantly intact, its original form and detailing still evident. Although the side extension(s) have increased the width of the house, its features, including its original windows and large prominent chimney with decorative cross banding remain prominent when viewed from the street.

2. THE PROPOSAL

The applicant is seeking consent to demolish the existing of side garage and erect a new single storey side extension. Whilst the current proposal is not identical to the previously refused applications ref: HGY/2025/2177 and HGY/2025/1310, they are similar as they all involve replacing the existing side garage with a larger structure to provide additional accommodation.

3. RELEVANT PLANNING AND ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

HGY/2026/0021 – Approval of details pursuant to conditions 5 (Chartered Engineer) attached to planning permission ref: HGY/2025/2064. Approved 30/01/2026.

PRE/2025/0388 – Erection of a new side extension. Pre-application meeting date 27/01/2026.

HGY/2025/2177 – Replacement of existing garage door with windows and brickwork, installation of front and rear roof lights to garage roof and raising the roof height of the garage by 0.97m. Installation of doors and steps to the rear elevation of garage. Refused 07/10/2025.

HGY/2025/2064 – Creation of a new basement and front and rear lightwells with glass balustrade, enlargement and alteration to the existing first floor rear dormer, and replacement of rear patio doors with double glazed timber doors. Approved 12/12/2025.

HGY/2025/1310 – Raising the height of the side garage roof by 0.85m to accommodate a new living space and two bathrooms within the roof space. Replacement of the garage door with windows and brickwork and installation of 2 new roof lights to the front and 2 new rooflight to the rear and garage roof. Replacement doors to the rear of the garage and new steps down to the rear garden. Refused 08/07/2025.

HGY/2025/1304 – Increase the height of the existing first floor rear dormer roof by 350mm, with accompanying work to replace the current windows with new double-glazed, painted timber casement windows to the rear dormer. Replacement of rear patio doors with double glazed painted timber doors. Approved 08/07/2025.

HGY/2025/0271 – Demolition of existing brick front boundary walls & piers, construction of new walls, gate posts, installation of metal railings with vehicular and pedestrian gates, including new crossover. Approved 20/06/2025.

HGY/2015/0746 – Modification of previously approved scheme (Ref: HGY/2013/0309). In addition the application includes for a new carriage driveway within the front garden, new fenestration to front and rear elevations and construction of a new front boundary wall. Approved 08/05/2015.

HGY/2015/2034 – Non-material amendment following a grant of planning permission HGY/2015/0746, to introduce alterations to design of entrance porch. Approved 05/08/2015.

HGY/2013/0309 – Erection of side extension at ground and first floor level, extension of existing loft space, formation of rear dormer, and creation of portico above existing front door. Approved 17/04/2013.

HGY/2008/0242 – Erection of first floor extension and conversion of garage into habitable room. Approved 18/04/2008.

4. CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal & External Consultees

The following were consulted on the planning application:

LBH Conservation Officer: Raised objection to the proposed demolition and replacement of the garage with a larger side extension. The application property currently makes a positive contribution to the Highgate Conservation Area. As per the previous application, the existing

garage and roof above is already oversized and whilst it is not an overly subservient feature, it reads as part of the same building. The proposed extension does not improve on the existing and is of an incongruous design and odd proportions that would disrupt the front elevation's architectural hierarchy. Ultimately, the new structure would be larger and more conspicuous than the existing one, causing less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset. This harm lacks clear public benefit justification, especially since the existing first-floor footprint is already generous enough to be rearranged comfortably to accommodate 3 bedrooms with ensembles and storage without needing the proposed extension.

Local amenity groups

Objections from Highgate Conservation Area Advisory Committee (HCAAC) and the Highgate Society were received and the reasons for objection can be summarised as follows:

HCAAC

- **Loss of Architectural Subservience:** The roof of the proposed extension would be significantly taller and larger than existing garage roof, resulting in the unacceptable loss of the extension's required subservient appearance.
- **Detriment to Heritage Features:** The design and fenestrations of the extension is of odd proportions that would disrupt the front elevation's architectural hierarchy, diminishing the property's positive contribution to the Highgate Conservation Area.
- **Reduction of Openness and Views:** The additional height of the side extension obstructs street views of trees and general openness, directly conflicting with criteria set out in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan.
- **Adverse Impact on Trees:** There are existing concerns regarding the proposal's potential negative impact on local trees.
- **Broader Policy Non-Compliance:** The proposal fundamentally fails to adhere to Haringey Council's development policies concerning Conservation Areas, as well as the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan.

Highgate Society

- The extension remains a substantial architectural intervention, not a minor or subordinate addition to the main house, particularly in relation to the eaves line and roof hierarchy.
- The proposal undermines the traditional subservience of ancillary elements (such as garages and side additions) to the main dwelling, which is a key characteristic in Highgate Conservation Area properties, where principal houses are typically clearly dominant over secondary side structures.
- The design changes (crown roof, link section, reduced roof area) are mainly aesthetic refinements and do not fully address issues of bulk and massing, particularly in relation to skyline presence and eaves line subordination.
- The proposal also results in an intensification of built form, replacing a simple garage opening with two windows that replicate the proportions of those on the main house, thereby increasing visual complexity and built presence, and contributing to a sense of overdevelopment.

Neighbour Consultation

The number of representations received from neighbours in response to notification and publicity of the application were as follows:

No of individual responses: 0

Objection: 0

Support: 0

Neutral: 0

5. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS

Design & heritage

Policy SP11 of the Strategic Plan and Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD both aim to enhance the built environment through high quality design that respects local context and positive aspects of the area. Policy DM1 sets out that development should relate positively to its locality in terms of building height, form, scale, massing, building lines and architectural details and styles.

DPD Policy DM12 'Housing Design and Quality' states that extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics and detailing of the original building, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.

DPD Policy DM9 states that proposals affecting a designated or non-designated heritage asset will be assessed against the significance of the asset and its setting, and the impact of the proposals on that significance; setting out a range of issues which will be taken into account. In relation to extensions or alterations to residential buildings, including roof extensions, Policy DM9 requires proposals to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, which respect and/ or complement the form, setting, period, architectural characteristics, detailing of the original buildings, including external features such as chimneys, and porches. The policy also requires the use of high-quality matching or complementary materials, in order to be sensitive to context.

The proposed development seeks to demolish the existing side garage and erect a new single storey side extension. Whilst the current proposal is not identical to the previously refused applications ref: HGY/2025/2177 and HGY/2025/1310 which involved the maintaining the garage structure and raising its roof to convert the entire garage into two-storey of additional accommodation, the current proposal is still similar to a those applications as the existing garage would be loss and replaced by a single storey side extension would also provide two-storey of accommodation. The main difference between the current proposal and the previously refused proposal is the introduction of a large crown roof with a link section to the new side extension instead of raising the roof height of the existing garage.

Side extension

As noted above, this application follows two previously refused applications for increasing the garage height (ref: HGY/2025/2177 and HGY/2025/1310). In the current proposal, the existing side garage would be demolished and replaced by a new single storey side extension with a large crown roof and a link section that connects the first/roof level of the new extension to the first floor of the main dwellinghouse. The link section would be similar height to the existing garage but the new extension with its crown roof would be 0.9m taller than the garage and the roof pitch would also be much steeper. The depth and width of the new extension would be similar to the existing garage.

The height of the external brickwork walls of the new extension would be increased to better align with the main dwellinghouse but because of this increase in ground floor height occurs internally also rather than just externally, the resultant crown roof, its form and massing become significantly more contrived and prominent, disproportionate to the brick element below.

As per the previous applications, the existing garage and roof above is already oversized and whilst it is not an overly subservient feature, it reads as part of the same building. However, the proposed replacement extension does not improve on the existing. It has an incongruous design with an odd form and proportions. The 'symmetrical' pavilion style form has an awkward relationship with the existing building; it appears somewhat detached but conspicuous because of its inconsistent proportions with the main dwellinghouse and the roof being a steep visible crown higher than the eaves line. This increases the prominence of this element and disrupts the hierarchy of the front elevation, unbalancing the compositing and detracting from the existing building design and important features.

The proposed side extension would replace an already oversized part of the host dwelling with an even larger, more incongruous and more conspicuous structure. It would have an uncomfortable relationship to the host dwelling and detract from the original design of the building. The current proposal has not overcome the previous reasons for refusal. Accordingly, the proposed replacement extension would be considered to cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the Highgate Conservation Area as it would have a negative impact on the contribution that No. 4 Sheldon Avenue makes to the significance of the CA.

Since Highgate CA is a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, and any harm caused to the significance of a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification and should be weighed against public benefits. Whilst the existing layout with steps to ensuites above the existing garage may not be ideal, given the existing large footprint of the first floor of the main dwellinghouse at 145 sqm, the existing space is generous and could be rearranged to comfortably accommodate 3 bedrooms with ensuites and storage. It is unclear how the proposed development would meet the public benefits definition set out in the PPG for the purposes of NPPF paragraph 215.

As such, the proposal would not comply with Policy DM9 of the Development Management, Development Plan 2017 and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would be unacceptable in heritage terms.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

London Plan Policy D6 outlines that design must not be detrimental to the amenity of surrounding housing, in specific stating that proposals should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, while also minimising overshadowing.

DPD Policy DM1 'Delivering High Quality Design' states that development proposals must ensure a high standard of privacy and amenity for a development's users and neighbours. Specifically, proposals are required to provide appropriate sunlight, daylight and aspects to adjacent buildings and land, and to provide an appropriate amount of privacy to neighbouring properties to avoid overlooking and loss of privacy and detriment to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Whilst the proposed side extension would introduce new windows to the front and side, given that those windows would be on the ground floor and set back from the site boundary and tall hedges and boundary fencing exist along the boundary with No. 2 Sheldon Avenue, it is not considered the proposal would result in the loss of privacy and overlooking to neighbouring property. Furthermore, the additional bulk and height from the new side extension is not significant enough to worsen the adjacent property's amenity. The proposal is acceptable in amenity terms.

6. CONCLUSION

The proposed development is not in accordance with Policies DH2 and DH5 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017, Policies DM9 and DM12 of the Development Management,

Development Plan Document 2017, and policies SP11 and SP12 of Haringey's Local Plan Strategic Policies 2017. The proposed development also does not accord with the relevant policies of the London Plan 2021 and the NPPF.

The proposal is considered unacceptable in respect of its character, appearance and impact on the site and CA. All other relevant policies and considerations, including equalities, have been taken into account. Planning permission should be refused for the reasons set out above.

7. RECOMMENDATION

The application is recommended for refusal for the following reason(s):

Refusal Reasons:

The proposed side extension, by reason of its design, including the excessive height, bulk and massing of its roof, would result in a poorly proportioned, overly dominant and incongruous addition that relates poorly to the main dwellinghouse and would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, contrary to Policies DH2 and DH5 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017, Policies DM9 and DM12 of Haringey's Development Management Plan (2017) and Policies HC1 and D6 of the London Plan (2021).