
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 May 2017

by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3169704

3 Rufford Street, Islington, London, N1 0AP

- 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 G Zapouni against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/0708/FUL, dated 22 December 2015, was refused by notice dated 24 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is additional floor to existing HMO.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council has referred me to references in the grounds of appeal¹ that it considers do not refer to the appeal scheme, including the reference to two rather than one reason for refusal. For the avoidance of doubt my decision relates to the decision dated 24 August 2016 as detailed in the heading above.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the additional floor on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The building is described as a four storey property that sits within a terrace. I understand that there is planning permission in place for the addition of a fourth floor to the building². In addition I note that roof additions exist to the other nearby buildings. However, the appeal scheme would seek to add a further floor over and above the approved fourth floor.
5. The addition would be formed by raising the parapet further and effectively form a flat roofed addition atop the approved fourth floor. The materials would be a zinc clad façade with glazing across the entire front elevation. It would be set back from the front of the building. I accept that this would serve to limit some visibility from the pavement in front of the site. However, it would be visible from wider views in the street scene and open space opposite.

¹ GOA paragraph 5.1

² LPA Ref P2015/0868/FUL

6. I appreciate that there have been roof additions in the locality. However, taken with the approved scheme for the site this would amount to a two storey addition. This further addition and the increase in the parapet would be visible above the top of the appeal building and the neighbouring buildings. The addition of a further floor would disrupt the roof line of the group within which the building is located. It would appear as an intrusive feature. This would be compounded by the large amount of glazing which would draw the eye and be at odds with the simple fenestration evident on the lower levels.
7. The addition would therefore harm the character and appearance of the area. it would be in conflict with Policy CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy, DM2.1 of Islington's Development Management Policies, the Islington Urban Design Guide and London Plan policy 7.8 which amongst other things seek well designed new developments that make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of an area and seek to resist roof extensions which project significantly above or disrupt the prevailing roof line. It would also be in conflict with paragraphs 56, 59, 61, 63 and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework which amongst other things seek to reinforce local distinctiveness and seek good design that improves the character of an area.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

D J Board

INSPECTOR