

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2016

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20th December 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/16/3160390

16 Florence Street, Islington, London N1 2DX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Duriez against the decision of Islington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P2016/2984/FUL, dated 26 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is a half width, single storey, glass extension on first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a half width, single storey, glass extension on first floor level at 16 Florence Street, Islington, London in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2016/2984/FUL, dated 26 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 531_01-E-SITE, 00-LOC, 01-E-001, 01-E-002, 01-E-003, 01-E-004, 01-E-005, 01-E-010, 01-E-011, 01-E-012 and 01-010.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those of the existing lower ground floor extension.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area; and the effect on the significance of the locally listed terrace.

Reasons

3. This property is part of a locally listed residential terrace that has retained the unity of its original design and the distinctive period features. The houses are three storeys in height above street level but as is common with such period dwellings, they have a raised ground floor to accommodate a basement. The Register of Locally Listed Buildings and Locally Significant Shopfronts 2010 describes them as being a good representation of the period with special street
-

value. They lie within the Upper Street (North) Conservation Area which follows Islington's main historic thoroughfare. Although set behind the Upper Street properties, this distinctive and relatively unaltered period terrace contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

4. The proposal would extend the existing half width, lower ground floor, glazed rear addition upwards, to add an upper ground floor level. This would provide internal accommodation in the area that is currently a raised terrace. The terrace is already partly enclosed by this property's existing half width, three storeys, rear addition and the parapet wall along the shared boundary with the neighbouring dwelling.
5. The extension would be higher than the neighbours adjoining rear extension but it would be significantly lower than this property's existing three storeys, rear addition. Its materials would match those of the existing glazed structure and would remain in contrast to the brickwork of the main dwelling and the adjoining extensions. As these properties are of four storeys when viewed from the rear, the existing half width, three storeys, extension appears subordinate to the scale and proportions of the overall dwelling. The new addition would be subservient to that extension.
6. There are a number of properties in the terrace that have been altered at this level. I do not have the planning history associated with these alterations and a number do not represent positive design features. There is an addition to the south, where a glazed, half width, element sits comfortably alongside a larger brick built extension. As with that development, the proposed arrangement of elements would result in a satisfactory combination that would retain the original character of the dwelling overall.
7. The backs of these properties face Wakelin House and the rear of Canonbury Court which lie outside the conservation area. Although there is open land to the rear of Canonbury Court, this does not appear to be publicly accessible. The proposal would therefore have little wider public visibility and because of its subservient overall height, the intervening trees and the existing enclosed nature of the recess in which it would be built, it would also have very limited prominence in views from the surrounding properties.
8. Overall, I am satisfied that the proposal represents good quality design that makes an effective use of this space. Given its subservience, in relation to the scale of the property overall and the existing three storeys extension, it would not alter the significance of the contribution that this terrace makes to the wider area. The relatively unaltered rear elevations contribute to the terrace being considered as a good representation of its period but I am not satisfied that the proposal would detract from this character. The rear window that would be covered has already been altered to provide a doorway to the raised terrace.
9. The development would have no public impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area. The impact on private views would be extremely limited and from outside the conservation area. In these views, the works would sit comfortably alongside the existing and would have a neutral impact on the conservation area and its setting. I am satisfied therefore that the

- proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and would not result in harm to it.
10. The development would not conflict with the design or heritage objectives of Policies 7.4, 7.6 or 7.8 of the London Plan; Policy CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011; or Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2013. As these policies generally accord with the design and heritage requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight.
 11. The Upper Street (North) Conservation Area Design Guidelines 2002 advise that full width rear extensions, higher than one storey; or half width rear extensions higher than two storeys, will not normally be permitted, unless it can be shown that no harm will be caused to the character of the area. The Council have approved the three storeys, half width, extension. However, in relation to the front of the property, it is only two storeys above street level. This proposal combines with that addition to form a full width two storey extension. This similarly relates to only a ground floor extension in relation to the front of the terrace. In any event, it would not result in harm to the character of the area and would not therefore conflict with the guidelines.
 12. The Supplementary Planning Document: Islington Urban Design Guide 2006 advises that rear extensions that disrupt the rhythm of the existing rear elevation or dominate the main building should be avoided. Particular care should be given to rear elevations visible from the public realm; and prominent upper parts of rear elevations visible from the private realm. The relevant examples of unacceptable additions, illustrated in the guide, are characterised by a close relationship between the extension and the eaves of the building. In this case, the proposal would be two storeys below the eaves. It would have no significant impact on the upper part of the rear elevation and it would not be visible from the public realm. It would not conflict with the objectives of the guide.
 13. I have considered all the matters raised by the Council but have found that this proposal would represent good design in this context. It would satisfy the duties set out within the legislation and meet the design and heritage requirements of the development plan and the *Framework*. I therefore allow the appeal.
 14. I have imposed a condition relating to the commencement of development in the interests of proper planning and a condition specifying the relevant drawings to provide certainty. I have required that the materials match the existing extension to ensure that it would have a satisfactory appearance.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR