



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 March 2021

by Kim Langford Tejrar LLB (Hons) BSc (Hons) PGDIP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3264042

1 Beacon Hill, London N7 9LY

- 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 AD Residential Investments Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Islington
 - The application Ref P2020/1785/FUL, dated 06 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 October 2020
 - The development proposed is 'demolition of an existing single storey side extension and erection of a two-storey side extension to provide a self-contained 2 bedroom dwelling and associated alterations'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description of development was amended following submission of the application; I have utilised the amended description.
3. The London Plan 2021 (LP 2021) was published on 1 March 2021 and is now part of the Development Plan. The Council's decision notice referred to the previous London Plan. I am satisfied that the equivalent policies in the new plan have broadly the same approach as their counterparts, and they do not alter my conclusions on the matter in any case.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area, particularly whether the proposal conserves or enhances the significance of Hillmarton Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located on a corner plot fronting Beacon Hill, with its flank elevation facing Hillmarton Road, within the Hillmarton Conservation Area. The 'host building' within the appeal site is an attractive semi-detached mid to late 19th Century semi-detached villa. The site is bounded by a brick wall which is topped with a fence towards the rear of the plot.
6. Beacon Hill has a sense of uniformity as its the built form is almost entirely such detached and semi-detached mid to late 19th Century villas. This uniformity is reinforced by a strong building line, prevalence of walls as boundary features and the built response to local topography. The eaves and

overall heights of buildings in Beacon Hill are broadly aligned with the immediately neighbouring buildings. This is achieved by variations in the extent to which the ground floor level is raised above the street. Boundary walls and landscaping soften these variations. The area of Hillmarton Road closest to Beacon Hill has a much greater variety of building types and scales, though other parts of the road and many of the roads which spur from it demonstrate the similar uniformity to Beacon Hill. The pattern and built form create a sense of symmetry and order which contributes strongly to the character of the Hillmarton Conservation Area (CA). Indeed, the Islington Conservation Area Design Guidelines (CADGs) identify that "*the generally consistent historic and architectural quality... gives the area a special character and appearance*".

7. The appeal site is at the lower end of Beacon Hill, where the ground level drops away more steeply and as such, its ground floor level is raised by the greatest extent. This, and its exposed deep flank wall, makes the host building prominent in both Beacon Hill and Hillmarton Road. The appeal proposal would introduce a relatively small side extension at ground level. Whilst its overall size seeks to create a sense of subservient addition, its flat roof, street level positioning and limited articulation in its design would create a bulky appearance which does not reflect the architectural quality of the host building. Moreover, the addition would appear particularly incongruous as it would not align with, or respect, the elevational proportions of the host building, wider semi-detached pair and other built form of Beacon Hill.
8. The CADGs identify that gaps between villas afford pleasant views and contribute to the spacious character of the area. The location of the appeal site on the junction of two roads is particularly open and the loss of open space at the side of the host building would not erode this character. However, the incongruity of the proposal would be exacerbated by its prominent position and the substantial loss of the boundary wall, which conceals the existing single storey side extension. The wall contributes to the character of the area and significance of the CA in its own right, as set out above.
9. Whilst there are limited examples of side extensions in the area, these are generally less prominently located and better respond to the proportions, design and siting of the host building. The Council's concerns regarding the coping materials could have been dealt with by way of a condition had the appeal been allowed.
10. The existing flank elevation is exposed and lacks particular interest; the proposed extension would create little additional interest due to its simple and bulky design. The proposal would also create a single dwelling which contributes towards local housing need. However, this limited public benefit would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA, nor the harm to the character of the host building and wider area. Great weight is to be given to conserving those elements of the CA which contribute to its significance.
11. For these reasons, the appeal proposal would fail to respond the character of the host building and surrounding area and cause less than substantial harm to those elements of the CA which contribute to its significance. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to policies HC1 and D3 of the LP 2021, policy CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy (CS), adopted 2011, and policies DM2.1, DM2.3 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies Document (LP:DMP), adopted 2013. These policies seek, amongst other things, development of a good

design which appreciates the character of its surroundings and conserves or enhances the significance of the historic environment.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons stated above, I find that the appeal proposal is contrary to the relevant policies of the Development Plan and causes less than substantial harm to the significance of the CA, which is not outweighed by the limited public benefits arising from the proposed development. The appeal is accordingly dismissed.

Kim Langford Tejrar

INSPECTOR