



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 October 2021

by C Cresswell BSc (Hons) MA MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/21/3274588

Flat D, 33 Grosvenor Avenue, London N5 2NP

- 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 Dylan Harapoff against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2020/0549/FUL, dated 15 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 9 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a second floor level side extension with terrace to rear and erection of replacement front and rear dormer roof extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a second floor level side extension with terrace to rear and erection of replacement front and rear dormer roof extensions at Flat D, 33 Grosvenor Avenue, London N5 2NP in accordance with the terms of the planning application, reference P2020/0549/FUL, dated 15 February 2020, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location Plan and 00_PL_PR Rev B.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details and permanently retained thereafter.

Procedural Matter

2. For conciseness, the description of development in the heading above is taken from the Appeal Form rather than the Application Form.

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 concerns an upper storey flat within a historic mid-terrace property. Like the neighbouring terraces on both sides of the street, it maintains a generally uniform architectural style along its length, even though some properties have been subject to modern alterations. One distinctive feature of these terraces are the two storey elements, which are slightly recessed from the street frontage. These separate the main three storey elements of the terraces, creating a roof level gap between them. This solid-void pattern is repeated at regular intervals along Grosvenor Avenue, contributing to the strong sense of visual consistency along this part of the street.
5. The proposed extension would occupy part of the roof level gap between the appeal property and its neighbour. During the course of my site visit, I saw that there were some other properties in the street where apparently similar roof level extensions had been constructed. Although I am informed by the Council that these extensions do not benefit from planning permission, the evidence indicates that they have been in place for some time and are unlikely to be removed in the foreseeable future. Indeed, they were noted by another Inspector in an appeal decision¹ dated January 2016. I would therefore agree with his view that the existing extensions are an integral part of the street scene, even if they do not benefit from planning permission.
6. The previous appeal decision allowed a roof extension at 51 Grosvenor Avenue which, I understand, was of a similar design to that being proposed in the current appeal. It would appear that this scheme was never implemented and the Council inform me that the planning permission has now lapsed. Nonetheless, I note the previous Inspector's point that while there is generally a consistent rhythm of gaps between properties in the street, the width of the gaps is inconsistent, due to the presence of other roof extensions. Given the degree of set-back, and the scale of the development proposed, the Inspector in that case was satisfied that the proposal would continue to emphasise the gap and division within the terraced blocks.
7. Based on my own observations, little appears to have changed within the Grosvenor Avenue street scene since the time of the previous appeal. Although I have assessed the current proposal on its individual merits, there are few reasons for me to disagree with the conclusions of the previous Inspector on these particular matters. While the proposed extension would reduce the size of the gap between different parts of the terrace, a gap would still exist and so a sense of architectural rhythm would be preserved. The scale of development would be subordinate to the host dwelling and, considering that the extension would be slightly recessed from the frontage, it would not be very prominent from longer distance vantage points within the street. As such, the overall impact on the street scene would be minimal.
8. I am aware that the Islington Urban Design Guide² has been published since the time of the previous appeal. Paragraph 5.141 of the guidance states that side extensions and end of terrace infill development can have a significant impact on the character of an area and its local distinctiveness. Similar points are made elsewhere within the document. However, for the reasons given above, I do not consider that the proposed extension would undermine the

¹ Appeal Decision: APP/V5570/W/3138254

² Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, Islington Council, January 2017

locally distinctive character of Grosvenor Avenue and so would be compatible with the overall objectives of the guidance. The potential for cumulative harm would be a matter for consideration were similar proposals to be advanced elsewhere in this area in the future.

9. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would have an acceptable effect on the character and appearance of the area. There would be no conflict with Policy D4 of the London Plan³, Policy DM2.1 of the Development Management Policies⁴ or Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy⁵. These policies all seek appropriate standards of design.
10. In the interests of clarity, standard conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the plans and within a time limit have been imposed. To help protect the character and appearance of the area, I have also imposed a condition which requires the external materials to be agreed by the Council before development takes place.

Conclusion

11. The appeal is allowed.

C Cresswell

INSPECTOR

³ The London Plan, March 2021

⁴ Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies, June 2013

⁵ Islington's Core Strategy, February 2011