The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 January 2022 by M Long

Decision by K Taylor BSc (Hons) PGDip MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/21/3283814
103 Plimsoll Road, Islington, London N4 2EB

- 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 Jacqui Barrett against the decision of the London Borough of Islington.
- The application Ref P2021/1887/FUL, dated 29 June 2021, was refused by notice dated 1 September 2021.
- The development proposed is a rear side extension street side, two storey in part.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matters

3. At the appeal stage, the appellant has submitted amended plans that include an additional bedroom at first floor level and changes to the openings on the rear elevation. The changes do not fundamentally alter the character of the proposed development and so have been considered as part of the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal site is a two storey, end-of-terrace property located at the corner of Plimsoll Road and Gillespie Road. It forms part of a terrace that is characterised by dwellings of a similar design, including rear outrigger features and butterfly roof forms. While there are some extensions and alterations to the rear of the terrace, the dwellings remain largely in their original form. There is a tall wall along the side boundary of the site and Gillespie Road that largely obscures views of the property's ground floor but still allows views of the first floor from the public realm.

6. The proposed development is a two storey side extension that would infill the gap between the existing outrigger and southern side boundary along Gillespie Road. The extension would protrude to the depth of the outrigger's rear

elevation and it would incorporate a flat roof that would project above the existing eaves of the outrigger. The proposed south-facing elevation would incorporate a glazed enclosure mid-way along its length and the rear elevation would have large, glazed openings at ground floor level and two windows at first floor level.

7. Due to the substantial size and scale of the side extension, particularly the additional bulk proposed at first floor level, the proposal would appear overly prominent within the Gillespie Road streetscene and would dominate views of the appeal property from the south. The proposed extension would result in the loss of a definable outrigger feature which would erode the general uniformity that characterises the wider terrace. The proposal would therefore appear as a discordant addition to the rear of the terrace and would be harmful to its character and appearance.

8. The amended floor plan submitted at the appeal stage include two windows at first floor level that have a reduced width from the originally proposed large window and Juliet balcony. The width of the two windows would be of a scale that is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area, however this would not mitigate the harm that would arise from the proposed extension's overall size and scale.

9. The appellant has directed my attention towards a number of side extensions with similarities to the proposal in the local area. Upon my visit to these sites, I noted that these developments are a significant distance from the site and would not be viewed together with the proposal. Moreover, these proposals are not so numerous that they form an overriding part of the character of the area. In any event, each case must be determined on its individual planning merits.

10. Given the above, the proposed development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies, adopted June 2013, which seeks to ensure that development proposals respect and respond positively to existing buildings, the streetscape and the wider context. It would also conflict with Islington's Core Strategy, adopted February 2011, specifically Policy CS8 which seeks to ensure the scale of development reflects the character of the area and Policy CS9 which seeks to ensure development is of high quality urban design. There would also be further conflict with Policy D3 of The London Plan, adopted March 2021, which seeks to ensure development proposals respond to the existing character of a place. Although the Council mention conflict with Policy D4, this Policy is primarily strategic in nature and focuses on the design process and scrutiny, it does not appear to be directly relevant to the modest nature of the appeal scheme. There would be further conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks to prevent development of poor design.

Other Matters

11. The appellant has stated that the proposed development would provide additional security following experiences of home invasions. However, it has not been made clear how the development would deliver these improvements and the proposal would not be the only means of achieving increased security, so this matter carries very limited weight. The appeal scheme would result in the provision of a home with additional bedrooms. While some benefits may arise from this, these would be limited in nature and relate to a single family

home. These matters would not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. The proposed development would not accord with the development plan, when considered as a whole. Based on the above, and having regard to all matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Long

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

K Taylor

INSPECTOR