



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 September 2020 by C Brennan BAE (Hons) M.PLAN MIPI

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/20/3251090

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 P2020/0431/FUL, dated 4 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 6 April 2020.
- The proposed development is ground floor extension and 1/2 width, flat roof finish first floor rear extension and associated external alterations including replacement glazing and associated alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

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 application form does not reference the proposed replacement windows shown on the submitted plans. However, this part of the proposal is referenced within the description set out within the decision notice. As such, for clarity and precision, the description of the proposed development set out within the above banner heading has been taken from the decision notice.
4. While the applicant on the application form was listed as Mr Richard Norridge, Mrs Eve Norridge is listed as the appellant on the appeal form. In correspondence received from the agents, it was confirmed that Mr Richard Norridge is the appellant. As such, his name has been included within the banner heading above.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Canonbury Conservation Area (CCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

6. 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 northeastern 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.

7. The appeal site is situated within the CCA. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that with respect to development affecting buildings or other land in a conservation area, "special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area." I consider that the special interest of the CCA is largely derived from the architectural merit of its buildings and its verdant, tree-lined streets.
8. Due to its scale and height above the rear and side eaves, the proposed first-floor half-width rear extension would appear as an overtly incongruous and bulky addition that would disrupt the original proportions of the appeal property. The flat roof of the proposed extension would contrast poorly with the pitched form of the existing roof, appearing as an obtrusive element that would fail to integrate with the form and appearance of the appeal property. Furthermore, as the proposed extension would be plainly visible within public views from Alwyne Square, the discordant relationship between the extension and the appeal property would have an especially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to both the architectural merit of the appeal property and the character and appearance of the surrounding area, it would therefore have a harmful effect on the character and appearance and the significance of the CCA.
9. While the appellant argues that the proposed extension would be visually distinguishable from the appeal property as a later addition, this does not provide sufficient justification for the proposal which would consist of a disproportionate and over-scaled addition that would fail to appear appropriately subordinate to the appeal property.
10. The appellant states that the proposal is in-keeping with the Islington Conservation Area Design Guidelines (ICADG) that extensions at first-floor level should have flat or low pitch roofs. However, the cited part of the guidance applies specifically to side extensions, not rear extensions. As such, the proposal does not align with the ICADG in this respect.
11. The appellant has drawn my attention to examples of development within the surrounding area. Regarding No 32, I saw during my site visit that the height of this extension appears to have been reduced when compared to the image of No 32 included in the Design and Access Statement. This likely relates to the enforcement case referred to by the Council in their delegated report, and so there is no precedent for a rear extension which rises above the eaves of its host property within the surrounding area. In any case, the proposed first-floor extension and its poor relationship with the rear and side eaves would be much more visually prominent given the appeal property's location on a corner site adjacent to Alwyne Square. As No 32's rear extension is more discreetly sited away, I do not consider that this example is directly comparable to, nor sets any precedent for, the proposal.
12. Regarding Nos 24 and 26, it is clear to me that both these properties were drastically remodelled as part of a single comprehensive scheme and so have a visually and architecturally coherent appearance. The proposal would be

- fundamentally different in nature, as it would result in the addition of an unsympathetic and bulky addition to an existing dwelling rather than a scheme which would completely alter the proportions, roof form and overall appearance of a semi-detached pair. I therefore consider that the development at Nos 24 and 26 is not comparable to nor sets any precedent for the proposal.
13. The rear extensions to Nos 17 and 19 Canonbury Park North and 6a Grange Grove are not visually prominent within the streetscene, and so are not comparable to the proposal which would be especially visible within public views. Furthermore, the two-storey side extensions at both Nos 10 and 16 are entirely different to the proposal and so provide no justifiable precedent for it.
 14. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CCA and so would cause unacceptable harm to its special interest as a designated heritage asset. It would therefore conflict with Policies 7.8 of the London Plan 2016, Policy CS9 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2.3 of the Development Management Policies 2013 (the DMP) which state, amongst other things, that development affecting heritage assets such as conservation areas should conserve or enhance the significance of those assets. The proposal would also conflict with Policy DM2.1 of the DMP which states, amongst other things, that proposals should have regard to local character and be designed to the highest standard.
 15. The proposal would also conflict with the ICADG, which states that the Council wishes to preserve the scale and integrity of existing buildings by ensuring that extensions are subordinate in terms of mass and height.
 16. The proposal would also conflict with the Islington Urban Design Guide 2017, which states that residential extensions must be subordinate to the original building and should respect the integrity, rhythm and visual amenity of the street.
 17. I have found that the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest of the CCA. However, there would be no public benefit that would outweigh that harm.

Other Matters

18. Whilst the appellant indicates that the proposal had been designed on the basis of pre-application advice received from the Council, such advice does not prejudice the Council's decision on a subsequent planning application. While I have some sympathy for the appellant regarding the changing views of the Council during pre-application discussions, it nonetheless falls on me to assess the proposal on its merits which, as can be seen from my reasoning above, I have found would be unacceptable.
19. I understand that the proposed development would provide the appellant and their family with additional living space. However, this does not justify the proposal which would be unacceptable for reasons set out above.
20. I understand that during the course of this appeal, permission has been given for a larger pitched-roof first-floor rear extension, application Ref. P2020/0432/FUL. The details and circumstances of this application aren't before me to consider. Regardless, each appeal must be considered on its own merits, and I have found that this proposal would be unacceptable for reasons set out above.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

C Brennan

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR