
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: 06 APRIL 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/20/3261328

52 Barnsbury Grove, Islington, London N7 8BP

- 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 Ms Sally Philip against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2020/1896/FUL, dated 15 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is two storey half width rear extension, new dormer to rear and rooflight.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The London Plan 2021 was adopted on 2 March 2021. Neither party referred time 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. Policy 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 is not critical to my decision, and I have not referred to it further.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on; (i) the character and appearance of the area, having particular regard to the Barnsbury Conservation Area; and (ii) living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal site is located within the Barnsbury Conservation Area (the CA) and I have had special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. The significance of the CA is found in its examples of late Georgian and early Victorian residential developments, which provide a consistent approach to design and are experienced as a number of complete areas of surviving architecture, allowing the CA to be appreciated on a large scale.
5. No 52 Barnsbury Grove is an end of terrace 19th century house and makes a positive contribution to the CA due to its position as one of a terrace with a uniform front façade.

6. The insertion of a roof light to the front roof slope would conflict with the remaining two dwellings in the terrace which have undisturbed rooflines. As a result, it would draw attention to the dwelling and insert an alien addition to the terrace. This would harm the significance of the CA which is clearly found in the uniformity of dwellings with the CA.
7. The rear extension would extend some three metres from the rear elevation, finishing less than one full storey below the eaves of the dwelling. This would significantly increase the bulk of the rear of the dwelling, and the combined scale and height of the extension would overwhelm the rear façade. It's size would not appear subservient to the main dwelling and would be harmful to the character of the rear of the dwelling and façade of the wider terrace. Whilst there is an existing small single storey extension on the property, and a single storey extension on the neighbouring dwelling, these are clearly of a scale that is subservient to the host properties. As such they sit comfortably within the context of each respective site.
8. The proposal would change the rear roof slope with a dormer and roof light. A dormer would, in principle, sit comfortably within the rear roof slope as it would reflect the dormers on the other two dwellings in the terrace. However, the dormer on the appeal property would be seen in conjunction with an additional roof light. As a result, the roof slope would appear cluttered and would fail to reflect or respect the terrace of dwellings. The replacement of the roof with slate tiles would be a benefit, however this would not outweigh the harm to the character of the CA through the proposal when considered in its entirety.
9. The proposal would create a discordant and alien development that would fail to preserve the character of the terrace of dwellings and the wider CA. As a result it would conflict with Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy 2011 and Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of the Islington's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2013, which collectively require development to protect the borough's unique character by preserving the historic urban fabric.

Living conditions

10. The ground floor flat of No 54 Barnsbury Grove has a single storey extension that is located between the two buildings. The projection of the proposed three metre extension would be immediately adjacent to the boundary with No 54 and would significantly overshadow the window on the ground floor flat extension. As a result, the occupiers of the adjacent ground floor flat would experience a detrimental loss of outlook which would be harmful to their living conditions.
11. Accordingly, I find that the proposal would conflict with Policy DM2.1 of the Islington's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2013 which requires development to provide a good level of amenity in respect of over dominance, sense of enclosure and outlook.

Other matters

12. I am aware that permission has been allowed for similar extensions on properties in the area. However, I do not have details of these schemes to enable me to make a meaningful comparison. In any event, I have determined the proposal on its own merits.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole.
Accordingly, for the reasons above I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

J Ayres

INSPECTOR