



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 22 December 2020

by A M Nilsson BA (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3256380

Flat F, 50 St Thomas's Road, London N4 2QQ

- 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 Neal Hollenbery against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/3614/FUL, dated 4 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 24 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is removal of existing pitched roof and erection of front and rear extensions at second floor level to Flat F no.50 St Thomas's Road.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the description of development from the Council's Decision Notice as this is more precise.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site comprises a part three storey and part two storey terraced building and is located on the corner of St Thomas's Road and Plimsoll Road. It is located in a predominantly residential area where there are a range of dwelling heights over, two, three and four storeys, mainly in terraces. The appeal site forms a distinct transition between the four storey terraces on St Thomas's Road and the two-storey terrace on Plimsoll Road, where the building on the appeal site drops to three, then two storeys to reflect the difference in heights. This transition provides a somewhat successful balance at this prominent corner location.
5. The appeal proposal would remove the existing pitched roof above the two-storey element of the building, where it adjoins the two storey properties on Plimsoll Road, and add an additional floor with flat roof, resulting in accommodation over three storeys.
6. Due to the increase in height, the proposal would significantly increase the bulk and massing of the building. It would erode the intended transition with the lower properties on Plimsoll Road, where as a result the extension would appear exposed and prominent.

7. I find that the use of a flat roof above the extension would create an uncomfortable relationship with the existing hipped roof of the building and the hipped roof of the adjacent property on Plimsoll Road. Due to these different roof styles being proposed in such close proximity to each other, the development would create a stark contrast and appear incongruous in the street-scene.
8. Although it is referred to that the building is of little architectural merit, I find that it occupies a relatively prominent position and the fact that it may be of little architectural merit does not justify allowing harmful development. I have also identified that, due to its staggered height, the existing building provides a somewhat successful balance between the buildings it adjoins on St Thomas's Road and Plimsoll Road, which would be harmfully lacking in the appeal proposal.
9. For the reasons given above, the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy (2011), Policy DM2.1 of the Islington Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013) and the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) which collectively seek, amongst other things, that developments enhance and protect Islington's built environment and reflect the character of the area.

Other Matters

10. The appellant refers to the enhancement of quality of residential accommodation which has ease of access to local facilities, shops and public transport. They also refer to the employment opportunities that would be created through construction of the development. Although such factors weigh in favour of the appeal, they do not overcome the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal is dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR