



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th December 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3235425

172d Blackstock Road, Islington, London N5 1HA

- 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 Haralabbous against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2018/3725/FUL, dated 6 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 18 February 2019.
 - The development proposed is creation of first floor additional living area (currently single storey ground floor dwelling).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Although not included in the Council's reason for refusal concern has been raised in the Council's officer report with respect to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers. I consider this matter to be significant and the appellant has been given the opportunity to comment on it. No-one would therefore be prejudiced by my taking this matter into consideration in the determination of this appeal.
3. I have taken the appellants surname from the application form and appeal form, although I note that different spellings have been used by the Council and within the appeal statement.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area; and the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties with particular regard to light and outlook.

Reasons

Living conditions

5. Blackstock Road comprises a mix of commercial properties at ground floor with residential flats above and to the rear. 172d comprises a ground floor 1 bedroom flat and is located to the rear of a hairdressing salon. The flat is accessed via a passageway from the street. The passageway gives access to a number of other residential properties.
6. Directly opposite the appeal site is residential property 174 Blackstock Road, which is separated from the proposed development only by the existing

passageway between the two properties. Given the scale and height of the proposed first floor extension in conjunction with its proximity to No 174 it would obstruct light and outlook from a ground floor window at this neighbouring property, which serves a bedroom.

7. In conclusion, the proposed development would be detrimental to the living conditions of the occupants of No 174 with particular regard to light and outlook. Accordingly, it would be contrary to policy DM2.1 of the Islington Local Plan Development Management Policies (DMP) which seek to provide a good level of amenity.

Character and appearance

8. To the rear of the site it is possible to see a range of extensions and alterations that have taken place to neighbouring properties. This creates a very constrained space with an eclectic mix of development styles.
9. The proposed extension would raise the height of the existing roof to create an additional storey. The pitched roof would sit between the rear of 172 and the neighbouring 2 storey dwelling and would not increase the ground floor footprint of the existing flat. The scale of development would accord with the prevailing mixed rhythm, character and appearance of the group of properties located within the vicinity of the appeal site. The proposal would therefore be in keeping with the character of the host building having regard to its use of matching materials, which would respect the broader local context.
10. The Islington Urban Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (SPD) advises that rear extensions must be subordinate to the original building and a full storey below eaves height. The proposed extension would be a full storey below the eaves of the original three storey dwelling (172) and the development would result in an extension to the original building which would be subordinate in size and scale to the host dwelling. Although the building has been subdivided into flats, its original proportions would be maintained as a result of the proposed development.
11. In conclusion, there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. In this respect the proposal complies with policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011 (CS) which require development to reflect the character of the area and policies DM2.1 and 2.3 of the DMP and the SPD which require development to be of a high quality design which makes a positive contribution to the local character of the area.

Conclusion

12. In conclusion, whilst I have found that the development would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, the impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No 174 is such that the appeal should be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR