
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 April 2017

by Elizabeth Pleasant DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/17/3169189
15 Prah Road, Islington, London N4 2RB

- 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 Walker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/4674/FUL, dated 27 November 2016, was refused by a notice dated 8 February 2017.
 - The development proposed is a second storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a second storey rear extension at 15 Prah Road, Islington, London N4 2RB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2016/4674/FUL, dated 27 November 2016, 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: Existing & Proposed Elevations, Location & Block Plans, AG15610-680 Rev A; Existing Floor Plans, AG15610-600; Proposed Floor Plans, AG15610-610.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used on the existing dwelling.

Procedural Matter

2. The Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, 2006 referred to in the Council's decision has been superseded by the Islington Urban Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document which was adopted in January 2017, (SPD).

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider terrace.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of an attractive three-storey short residential terrace. The host property retains its original two-storey rear outrigger which
-

- has a flat roof. The appeal proposal would extend above part of this outrigger to provide a bathroom which would serve the second floor accommodation.
5. No other property within the terrace has extended above their original rear outrigger. However, the rear elevation of the original terrace as a whole has been altered considerably. It displays an eclectic mix of extensions/alterations, including ground and second floor rear additions, a first floor glazed conservatory, a large dormer roof extension and roof terraces. Consequently, the simple form and rhythm provided by the outriggers and which contributed to the character and appearance of the terrace has already been significantly diminished.
 6. Islington's Urban Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document, 2017 (SPD) advises that upper floor rear extensions are often acceptable providing there is a punctuating gap between the eaves height and top of the extension, and the materials, detailing and form of the extension are sympathetic to the terrace.
 7. The proposed extension would be small and clearly subservient to the host property. The proposed flat roof would be positioned well below the terrace's existing decorative eaves, and consequently the original form and intrinsic design characteristics of the host property would remain clearly discernible. Furthermore, the extension's simple box form, fenestration and brick finish would reflect the character of the existing outrigger and terrace as a whole.
 8. The rear elevation of the terrace is not open to public views from the street. Although the occupants of neighbouring properties would have views of the proposal, it would not appear incongruous when seen in the context of the wide range of extensions that have been taken place to the rear of the host terrace. Moreover, there are very similar extensions to that proposed visible on Ambler Road, and No 11 Romily Road displays an almost identical extension which is clearly visible from the appeal site.
 9. I conclude that the proposed extension would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and wider terrace. I therefore find no conflict with the development plan, and in particular with Policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy, 2011 and Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan, Development Management Policies, 2013 which seek, amongst other things, to protect Islington's distinctive character and provide high quality design which respects and responds to existing buildings. I also find no conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan, 2016 which seek to protect local character and incorporate high quality design and materials. Furthermore, the proposal would not conflict with the Council's SPD, the aims of which are set out above.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that subject to conditions specifying the approved plans and details of the materials, which are necessary to provide certainty and safeguard the character and appearance of the host property, the appeal should be allowed.

Elizabeth Pleasant

INSPECTOR

