

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by **Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI**

Decision date: 28 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3166614
278-280 Caledonian Road, London, N1 1BA.

- 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 Andrew Panayi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/4079/FUL, dated 12 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 12 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a rear addition to ground floor flat including internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear addition to ground floor flat including internal alterations at 278-280 Caledonian Road, London, N1 1BA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2016/4079/FUL, dated 12 October 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The external materials shall match those of the existing building unless, before the erection of the external walls, details of materials are submitted to and agreed in writing with the local planning authority. If non matching materials are used, they shall be in accordance with the agreed details.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawings 1-4 Rev B, and Design and Access Statement.
 - 4) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area at any time.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Barnsbury Conservation Area contains good examples of formal late-Georgian/early Victorian residential development, much of which is set out in squares and terraces. Brick and smooth white painted render are common facing materials.
-

4. The site is a 5 storey mid-terraced property which has an existing large 3-storey rear extension. The proposed single storey extension would be attached to this extension. The adjoining properties also have rear extensions.
5. The proposed extension would be on the footprint of an existing canopy. The canopy is of an unfinished timber construction with a dilapidated, corrugated plastic roof. It is scruffy and detracts from the appearance of the building. I note that the canopy does not have planning permission but nonetheless, it exists and I have nothing to suggest that it is unlawful. Therefore, its removal is a material consideration.
6. The single storey nature of the extension, its parapet roof, and symmetrical arrangement of 4 units of glazed doors, would make for a neat and simple design. I accept that the original building has been dramatically extended but given the shallow depth and small-scale nature of the proposed extension, along with its replacement of an existing structure, I consider that the extension would not make any significant difference to the cumulative amount of extensions to the building. I therefore consider its scale, form and proportion to be in keeping with the existing property.
7. Paragraph 10.18 of Islington's Conservation Area Design Guidelines (ICADG) allows for full width one-storey extensions and therefore I find no conflict with this policy. I note the Council's reference to a previously dismissed appeal at the site¹ but that was for a proposal to infill a valley roof. It was, therefore, a completely different scheme to the one before me.
8. I conclude that the proposed extension would preserve the character and appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area. I, therefore, find no conflict with Policies DM2.1 or DM2.3 of the Islington Local Plan Development Management Policies, 2013 or CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy, 2011. These policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design which conserves or enhances conservation areas. I find no conflict with Islington's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, 2017 or the ICADG which have similar objectives.

Conditions

9. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary, in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition in respect of materials is necessary in the interests of visual amenity. It is necessary to prohibit the use of the roof as a terrace in the interests of the privacy of adjoining occupiers.

Conclusion

10. I have considered all other matters raised, including representations from interested parties, but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached and I allow the appeal subject to conditions.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/V5570/W/16/3157114