



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 January 2023

by Chris Baxter BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th February 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/22/3303951

87 Fairbridge Road, Islington, London N19 3EP

- 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 Robert Neophytou of SY Properties Ltd against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/3320/FUL, dated 5 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is described as “erection of a roof extension over outrigger and enlargement of rear dormer to roof”.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the appeal building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The area surrounding the appeal site is characterised predominantly by residential terraced properties of similar architectural design and materials. Whilst there are examples of other forms of development in the wider area, the consistent styles and use of materials, particularly on Fairbridge Road and Scholefield Road, positively contribute to the character of the immediate area surrounding the appeal site.
4. The proposals would introduce a form of development that would not be in keeping with or harmonise with the existing style of built form in the immediate area. The proposals would likely be screened from public views along Fairbridge Road, nevertheless the extensions would be dominant features when viewed from Scholefield Road and from some residential properties on Fairbridge Road.
5. Part of the proposal would be located above an existing rear addition and would not cover the full width of the property being set down below the height of the current rear elevation. The extensions would also be viewed, from some vantage points, against the backdrop of 2 Scholefield Road. However, due to the design and materials of the proposals, they would appear as incongruous features within the immediate locality.
6. I note the use of modern and traditional materials on the apartment block on the corner of Scholefield Road and Zoffany Street. This, however, is not comparable to the proposals given the proximity between the apartment block and the appeal site and that the apartment block is a different form of

development. The proposed use of aluminium and zinc materials would not complement the character of the appeal property or the appearance of the surrounding area.

7. It has been described that the proposed fenestration would match the existing. However, due to the design and use of inappropriate materials, the proposals would not respect the integrity and rhythm of the built form in the area and would be dominant and discordant structures in the street scene.
8. Accordingly, the proposals would be harmful to the character and appearance of the appeal building and surrounding area. The proposals fail to accord with Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, Policy CS8 of the Islington's Core Strategy 2011, Policy DM2.1 of the Islington's Local Plan Development Management Policies 2013, Islington's Urban Design Guide 2017 and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which seeks development to respect and respond positively to existing buildings, the streetscape and the wider context, including local architectural language and character.
9. The proposals would be an efficient use of previously-developed land being in an accessible location close to public transport and social, employment and commercial uses. The appellant has indicated that the proposals would not harm the living condition of neighbouring occupiers. I have also had regard to the appellants statement of case including matters relating to the previous scheme and photographs provided. These matters, however, do not outweigh the harm I have identified with regards to character and appearance.

Conclusion

10. The proposals would conflict with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the provisions of the Framework, which outweigh this finding.
11. Therefore, for the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Chris Baxter

INSPECTOR