



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 July 2026

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6010572

4 Sheldon Avenue, Hornsey, Haringey, N6 4JT

- 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 Robert Murad against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Haringey.
 - The application Ref is HGY/2026/0759.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the side garage and erection of a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the demolition of the side garage and erection of a single-storey side extension at 4 Sheldon Avenue, Hornsey, Haringey, N6 4JT, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref HGY/2026/0759, and the plans submitted with it, 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: proposed block plan; proposed front elevation (01); proposed side elevation (02); proposed rear elevation (03); proposed sections A, B and C; proposed floor plans (ground floor, first floor, loft); proposed roof plan.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side extension on the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. No 4 is a two-storey detached house on the eastern side of Sheldon Avenue, close to its junction with Hampstead Lane. It is brick-built, with a two-storey side extension to the north side and a large single-storey garage extension on its south side. It would appear to be designed in a modified Arts and Crafts style. The proposed development would involve the demolition of the existing garage and its replacement with a single-storey side extension having living accommodation on

the ground floor and extensions to first-floor bedrooms in the roof space. The width of the new extension would be similar to that of the existing garage.

4. Policy DM9 of the Council's Development Management DPD (DPD) states that proposals for extensions to existing buildings in Conservation Areas should complement the architectural style, scale, proportions, materials and details of the host building and should not appear overbearing or intrusive. Policy DM 12 of the DPD indicates that extensions to residential buildings will be required to be of a high, site specific, and sensitive design quality, and respect and/or complement the form, architectural characteristics, and detailing of the original buildings, including features such as chimneys, and porches. High quality matching or complementary materials should be used appropriately and sensitively in relation to the context.
5. Policy DH 2 of the adopted Highgate Neighbourhood Plan (NP) indicates that extensions to existing buildings should preserve or enhance the character or appearance of Highgate's conservation areas, and respect the setting of heritage assets. Development should preserve or enhance the open character where this is a feature of the area. Policy DH 4 of the NP indicates that side extensions to detached houses should be sensitive to and respect the character of the streetscape, and not disrupt the integrity of the individual architectural composition or group where these contribute to the character of the local area. They should be subordinate in scale to the original dwelling and complement its character in terms of design, proportion, materials and detail.
6. The Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal document (CAA), sub area 7 (Bishops) states that it is important to retain the original character and details of the sub area. It comments very generally about this section of Sheldon Avenue and notes that it exhibits a relatively uniform appearance, with houses of a broadly similar height, size and character. None of the general negative contributors outlined in the CAA for the sub area would appear to relate to this current proposal at No 4.
7. The Council contends that the proposed extension, by reason of 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 a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the CA.
8. From the information available to me, the current garage would appear to be an addition to the original house dating from the 1970s. It has very low eaves above the garage doors and a large expanse of hipped roof above, extending to the eaves of the main house. The proposed extension would result in the replacement of the existing bulky and overly dominant garage roof with a slimmer hipped roof culminating in a small crown element around 0.9 metres higher than the existing garage roof. It would appear as visually separated from the main house though connected to it by a short linking pitched-roof element at the same height as the existing garage roof. The degree of separation from the side wall of the main house would be small, and the extension would have the appearance of a subservient element to the main building. The new roof pitch would be only slightly steeper than that of the existing garage roof.
9. The Council's officers acknowledge that the garage and roof above is already oversized. In my opinion, the design of the existing garage building results in a significantly incongruous and bulky addition to the original house, with a marked overall horizontal appearance, at odds with the design of the rest of the house,

including, and especially, the narrow, two-storey extension on the north side. The new roof would be a little higher than existing, but the overall bulk would appear less by virtue of the raised eaves and the vertically tapering design. The appellant contends that the new roof would have a front slope area of some 12 sq metres as opposed to the existing 15.5 sq metres. I note that the appellants figure for the new roof does not include the link element but, despite this, it would appear that the new roof would still be somewhat smaller in area than the existing.

10. From my site visit, it would appear that certain other houses in the immediate vicinity already have significant extensions to the side. These include the neighbouring No 6, which has a complex garage/accommodation building on its north side, separated a little from the main house but appearing as linked, and also No 3 opposite which has a prominent forward projecting, garage/accommodation structure connected to the main house. Both of these structures appear as relatively modern or with clearly modern elements. The proposed extension at No 4 would be less dominant in appearance than these examples and would relate more closely to the general character of the host property and its immediate surroundings.
11. Finally, there have been concerns raised that the proposed extension, by reason of its increased height, would interfere with current views of ornamental brickwork on the side elevation of the chimney. However, the upper part of the roof of the extension would be sufficiently separated from the side elevation of the house, such that the ornamental brickwork would remain clearly visible in the street scene when passing the house.
12. In conclusion, the proposal would involve the construction of a single-storey extension with an eaves height more in keeping with general ground-floor levels of the main house, and with front windows to replace the garage doors and to match those existing in the house. The front roof slope of the extension would occupy a smaller area than the existing front roof slope, and the extension would appear as subordinate to the main house. It would not appear overbearing or intrusive and would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the CA. On the basis of the above, the proposal would not conflict with Policies DM9 or DM12 of the LP, or with policies DH2 or DH4 of the NP. Accordingly, I allow this appeal subject to the conditions set out above.

Conditions

13. I have attached a condition relating to plans because it is necessary that the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I have attached a further condition relating to materials in the interests of the visual amenities of the area.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR