



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 July 2021

by G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI

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

Decision date: 27 July 2021.

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/21/3277809

70 Elwood Street, Islington, London N5 1EH

- 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 Filis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/1021/FUL, dated 1 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 May 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of second floor outrigger roof extension (with side facing Juliet balcony) and zinc re-cladding of existing (main) dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed extension on the character and appearance of the host building and wider area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end of terrace house, located at the corner of Avenell Road and Elwood Street. The surrounding area, including the host terrace of houses, particularly to the north, east and south, has a pleasant suburban feel, largely characterised by rows of terraced houses that are predominately 2-storey in scale. These characteristics help give the street scene of this part of the area quite a strong rhythm and consistency. In contrast, to the west of the site, on the opposite side of Avenell Road, the scale and form of development is markedly different as the buildings are larger and taller due to being associated with the redevelopment of a former football stadium.
4. Although the proposed development would not be seen from Elwood Street, it would be readily visible from Avenell Road. There is an existing 'box dormer' roof extension to the main rear roof form of the appeal property adjacent to where the proposed extension would sit. While the evidence indicates that it has planning permission, due to its form and scale, it is very much at odds with the pleasant built form of the host terrace and wider area. As a consequence, given its prominence when viewed from Avenell Road, this existing roof extension has a negative influence on the character and appearance of the area.

5. The proposed extension would add a third storey above an existing outrigger to the rear of the house. Outriggers of this type appear to be a well established feature of the area, such that the principle of rear development on that kind of footprint would be acceptable in terms of its potential effect on character and appearance. In this case, however, due to its height and discordant design relative to the host house and wider terrace, it would sit awkwardly to the detriment of the local townscape. Although it would be seen in the context of the equally unsympathetic taller existing dormer roof extension, which is proposed to be re-clad to match the proposed zinc faced extension, given its prominence, the proposed extension would exercise a fairly strong influence on the street scene, such that the harm arising would be reasonably significant.
6. I recognise that in some respects the proposed development would echo the design of the nearby development to the west, at the former football ground. Nonetheless, as outlined above, the character and appearance of the townscape on the eastern and western sides of this part of Avenell Road are quite distinct. While I am also mindful that the existing outrigger has a flat roof, for the reasons set out above, the proposed extension would not represent any kind of improvement in this regard.
7. For the foregoing reasons, therefore, the proposed extension would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and wider area. Consequently, in those respects, it would conflict with Policies D1 (London's form, character and capacity for growth) and D4 (Delivering good design) of The London Plan March 2021, Policy CS 8 (Enhancing Islington's character) of Islington's Core Strategy February 2021, and Policy DM2.1 (Design) of the Development Management Policies June 2013, as well as with Islington's Urban Design Guide January 2017.

Conclusion

8. For the above reasons, therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

G D Jones

INSPECTOR