
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2021

by J Ayres BA Hons, Solicitor

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 31 MARCH 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/20/3256665

6 Ambler Road, Islington, London N4 2QU

- 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 Tooke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2020/0940/FUL, dated 1 April 2020, was refused by notice dated 16 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is second storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for second storey rear extension at 6 Ambler Road, Islington, London N4 2QU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2020/0940/FUL, dated 1 April 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 20014/001 RevP3; 20014/002 Rev P3.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the construction of the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The London Plan 2021 was adopted on 2 March 2021. Neither party referred me to any of its policies as an emerging plan, although policies from the previous version of the London Plan from 2016 were cited in the reason for refusal and referred to by both parties. Policies 7.4 and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 are not critical to my decision, and I have not referred to them further.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located towards the end of a terrace of dwellings on Ambler Road, and the rear of the property is seen in the context of the row within it sits, and the row of buildings along the A1201. All are three storey in height with some appearing to have additional space within the roof. The front

elevations are largely uniform in character, providing a strong, fixed regularity to the street scene. Conversely, the rear elements of the row along Ambler Street, and the rear elevation of the properties on the A1201 have varied facades due to extensions and alterations. The outrigger projection on a number of dwellings has also been altered, and whilst it remains a feature of the rear façade, there is little symmetry or ingrained pattern to this feature when viewed in the context of the surrounding development.

5. Due to the significant height of the existing dwelling, and the variation in the rear elevations that are clearly seen within the context of the appeal site, the proposal would not dominate the rear elevation of the terrace. It would add substantial height to the outrigger, however it would not project significantly beyond the rear elevation, and the materials would ensure that the extension would sit comfortably within the context of the appeal dwelling and wider area.
6. As such I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character of the dwelling or wider area. It would comply with Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies 2013. These policies collectively seek to ensure that high quality architecture and urban design are used to enhance the built environment and provide development that reflects the character of the area.

Conclusion

7. I have found that the proposal would comply with the development plan, there are no material considerations to justify a decision other than in accordance with the plan. Accordingly, the appeal should succeed.
8. I have specified the plans for certainty and imposed a condition ensuring that the materials match the dwelling in the interest of protecting the character of the hots dwelling and wider area.
9. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal is allowed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR