



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020 by Thomas Courtney BA(Hons) MA

Decision by Andrew Owen MA BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 12 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3251135

87 Fairbridge Road, Islington, London, N19 3EP

- 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 R. Neophytou (SY Properties Ltd) against the decision of London Borough of Islington Council.
 - The application Ref P2019/3033/FUL, dated 9 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 3 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is a rear loft extension and outrigger extension.
-

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located on a corner plot on the north western side of Fairbridge Road at the junction with Scholefield Road. It accommodates a three-storey end-of-terrace dwelling comprising five flats. The dwelling features a two-storey outrigger as well as a small roof dormer to the rear. The surrounding area is mostly residential and characterised by terraced properties similar to the appeal property.
5. The proposal would result in the erection of a dormer roof extension as well as a pitched roof extension to the existing outrigger. Although the appellant states that the development would be sympathetically designed, I find that the proposed roof profile of the outrigger extension would appear odd because of its steep angled pitch. The extension would also occupy the full depth of the existing outrigger and reach approximately 3 metres in height. I concur with the Council in that this would represent a significant increase in bulk at second floor level. The plans also indicate it would project above the eaves of the main roof. Overall it would not appear subservient to the main house and, in my view, it would fail to adequately harmonise with the host dwelling.

6. Furthermore, I find the proposed enlarged dormer is poorly designed in light of its unusual siting in the corner of the roof slope rather than in a more central position set-in from the eaves and sides typical of dormers in the vicinity. This would serve to unbalance the appearance of the rear elevation of the dwelling, giving it an irregular and asymmetrical appearance. My attention was drawn to other dormers in the vicinity of the site, such as at 91 Fairbridge Road, however these appear to be appropriately positioned within their respective roof slopes. These examples have not altered my view that the proposed dormer would be harmful.
7. When considering the two elements of the proposal together, the development as a whole would appear excessively bulky and awkward. Due to its prominent location on a corner plot, the proposal would be entirely visible from Scholefield Road and would constitute an incongruous development which would adversely impact the streetscene.
8. I note that the appellant asserts that the proposal attempts to replicate the approved development at the neighbouring property (ref. P2017/3644/COLP). The proposal would indeed mirror the that scheme, however these works have yet to be implemented and it cannot be assumed they will. Notwithstanding the proposal's attempt to mimic the adjoining scheme, it would be more conspicuous than No. 89 due to its closer proximity to and greater visibility from Scholefield Road.
9. I acknowledge there are other outrigger extensions in the wider area and I have had regard to the examples provided by the appellant. My attention was drawn to Nos. 93 and 103, within the same terrace as the appeal property, that both feature extensions to their rear outriggers. However these examples carry little weight as they are markedly different to the proposal. They are more discreet in their scale and appearance being flat-roofed and only projecting out by approximately 1.5-2 metres from the main rear wall of their host dwellings. Similarly, the extended outrigger at No. 85 which lies opposite the appeal site is not comparable to the proposal. Indeed, that extension primarily accommodates a roof terrace so is lacking bulk. In any case, each proposal should be assessed on its own merits and this is the approach I have adopted.
10. Furthermore, whilst the appellant states that the development would improve the living conditions of the existing occupiers and would adhere to national policy supporting the use of airspace above existing accommodation, these benefits are limited and would not outweigh the permanent harm to the character and appearance to the host dwelling and the surrounding area I have identified.
11. Given the above, I conclude the proposal would constitute a dominant and incongruous form of development which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area. It would therefore conflict with Policy DM2.1 of Islington Council's Development Management Policies document of the Local Plan, the guidance provided in the 'Urban Design Guide' Supplementary Planning Document, and the National Planning Policy Framework which together seek to ensure proposals are well designed, respond positively to existing buildings, the streetscape and their surrounding context.

Recommendation

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

Thomas Courtney

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. 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