



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 January 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN

Decision by Kenneth Stone BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/19/3238437

29 Canonbury Park North, Islington, London N1 2JZ

- 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 Richard Norridge against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/2222/FUL, dated 18 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 13 September 2019.
 - The proposed development was originally described as "remodelling a two storey, semi-detached dwelling house with a single storey rear and side extension with a set back from the side boundary to maintain openness and views".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for single storey rear and side extension and associated alterations at 29 Canonbury Park North, Islington, London N1 2JZ, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2019/2222/FUL, dated 18 July 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 1. The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans: 1801.021 Rev E, 1801.022 Rev E, 1801.024 Rev E, 1801.025 Rev E, 1801.030 Rev E, 1801.032 Rev E, 1801.033 Rev F, 1801.36 Rev A, 1801.LP and 1801.SP.
 3. No development shall commence until details/samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.
 4. Prior to commencement of the development, tree protection monitoring and site supervision measures shall be carried out by a suitably qualified tree specialist in accordance with the Arboricultural Method Statement dated 10th August 2018.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.
-

Procedural Matters

3. The description of the proposed development set out within the above banner heading has been taken from the application form. However, this includes superfluous information which was intended to provide some justification for the proposal. The Council amended the description of development and the altered description is included in the appeal form as an agreed amended description and on the Council's decision notice. For clarity and precision, the amended description of the proposed development set out within the above decision has been taken from the decision notice.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area, which includes the Canonbury Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site comprises a two-storey, semi-detached dwellinghouse on the corner of Canonbury Park North and Alwyne Square. The appeal property has an existing single-storey side element which is set back from the front façade and extends up to the site's north eastern boundary. The appeal property forms part of Nos. 7-29, a row of architecturally heterogeneous semi-detached pairs on the northern side of Canonbury Park North. The site lies within the Canonbury Conservation Area, whose significance is largely derived from the architectural merit and diversity of its buildings and its verdant, tree-lined streets.
6. The adjoining half of the semi-detached pair, No. 27, has a single-storey side extension which appears flush with its front façade. This extension infills the full width between the southwestern elevation of the host dwellinghouse and the southwestern boundary of the site, and abuts a larger single storey side extension at No. 25 which projects forward of the front façade of that property. Many properties within Nos. 7-29, as well as many semi-detached properties on the opposite side of Canonbury Park North, have side extensions or garages of varying design which are often built to the boundary.
7. The proposed side extension would maintain a distance of 1m from its adjacent boundary and would be visibly set back from the front façade. As such, the proposed side extension would maintain an appropriately subordinate appearance to the appeal property, whilst the rear element of the proposal would remain hidden from public views. Compared to the existing side extension at No. 27, which measures 3.6m in width according to the submitted plans, the proposed extension would have a width of 4.8m. Given that side additions of varying scale and design are commonplace within the surrounding area, the width of the proposed side extension would not be out of keeping and would be an acceptable addition. Furthermore, as the proposed side extension would be no wider than the existing side addition of the appeal property, it would not unacceptably unbalance the symmetry of the appeal property with No. 27. Both properties are already asymmetrical at ground-floor level, as is broadly characteristic of the street scene. The proposed development would not cause harm to the appearance of the appeal property, the site or surrounding area, including the Canonbury Conservation Area. The proposed

development would have a neutral effect on the significance of the Conservation Area and so would preserve it.

8. There would be no loss to the area's sense of spaciousness or soft landscaping, as the proposal would be set back from the side boundary and would retain an appropriately sized front garden. The Arboricultural reports conclude that there would be no material loss of significant trees and the verdant tree lined character of the area would not be adversely affected.
9. The proposal would not adhere to the criteria for side extensions as set out within paragraph 8.19 of the Canonbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002), as it would not be set back at least 3m from the front corner of the appeal property. However, this is acceptable on balance as the proposal would respond positively to the height, scale and proportions of buildings in the immediate area, as per paragraph 8.8 of the same document. Given that surrounding buildings do not rigidly adhere to the criteria as set out in paragraph 8.19, the proposal would broadly comply with the Canonbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines and would therefore be acceptable on this basis.
10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the site, surrounding area and Canonbury Conservation Area, which would be preserved. The proposed development would therefore comply with Policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013), the Urban Design Guide SPD (2017), the Canonbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002) and the National Planning Policy Framework (2019), which seek development proposals should be designed to the highest standards, reflect local character, and preserve and enhance the historic built environment.

Other Matters

11. The Council has drawn my attention to two previous applications on the appeal site. Regarding the scheme dismissed at appeal in December 2018, that related to a proposal for a two-storey side and rear extension. That proposal is not directly comparable to the proposal determined under this appeal. As such, the comments of the Inspector included within the delegated report do not correlate to or represent the impact that the proposal would have in terms of its effect on the character, appearance and significance of the Conservation Area. Regarding the previously approved scheme, the details of that case are not before me to consider, and regardless, each appeal must be considered on its own merit.

Conditions

12. The conditions which are imposed are those which have been suggested by the Council, but with some variation in the interest of clarity and precision having regard to the advice on imposing conditions in the Framework and Planning Practice Guidance.
13. In addition to the standard timescale condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the scheme be built in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt.

14. The Council have suggested a condition requiring that the external surfaces to be used in construction should match those used in the existing building. However, they have also suggested a condition requiring that details and samples of all facing materials should be submitted to them for approval prior to superstructure work commencing onsite. As both conditions relate to materials, it would be unreasonable and unnecessary to impose both of them. In the interests of preserving the character and appearance of the appeal property and the surrounding Conservation Area, I consider that a condition requiring the submission and approval of all facing materials to be used in construction would be more appropriate in this case.
15. To preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding area and avoid damage to retained trees, I have also imposed a condition requiring that the tree protection monitoring and site supervision measures set out in the submitted arboricultural method statement must be met.
16. Conditions 3 and 4 require that the appellant must undertake certain actions prior to the commencement of development, in order to ensure that necessary details and measures are provided and carried out at the appropriate time. The appellant has provided written agreement to these conditions.

Conclusion and Recommendation

17. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

18. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Kenneth Stone

INSPECTOR