
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2023

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/22/3311294

9 Canning Road, Islington, London N5 2JR

- 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 Mark Wood against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2022/2761/FUL, dated 25 July 2022, was refused by notice dated 16 September 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first-floor rear extension to outrigger.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a mid-terrace dwelling of traditional style within a mainly residential area. In the rear of the terrace to which No 9 belongs, most properties have paired 2-storey outriggers with consistent rooflines and a single storey element that projects rearwards into the garden. Despite various external alterations and extensions that have taken place at the rear of this terrace, the outriggers create a welcome sense of unity and form a distinctive rhythm. The appeal dwelling is not a listed building. The site does not fall within a conservation area.
4. The proposal is to introduce a first-floor extension above the existing single storey rear projection. The new addition would be no taller or wider than the building to which it would attach. The resultant 2-storey rear projection would, however, be noticeably longer and larger than that of its attached counterpart, which is 11 Canning Road, and several others in the same terrace. By elongating the 2-storey element of the outrigger and removing its stepped profile at first floor level, the general balance and broad symmetry of the rear projection that is paired between Nos 9 and 11 would be unduly disrupted.
5. There is, as the appellant points out, some variation in the appearance and built form of dwellings in the terrace to which No 9 belongs. That the height of dwellings within this terrace varies to reflect the gently sloping ground and the rear building line is slightly staggered in places visually accentuates these differences. Nevertheless, the proposal would cause a notable imbalance in the

appearance of the rears of No 9 and 11 and it would interrupt the rhythm and pattern of outriggers at the back of the terrace. In doing so, the appeal scheme would be a discordant feature and an unwelcome addition to the host building and the local area. Its harmful impact could not be mitigated by the use of materials to match those of the existing dwelling and the introduction of a traditional sash window, as proposed.

6. The Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) acknowledges that there may be circumstances when extending a building by continuing the existing form, and using matching materials is important. It adds that single half-width upper floor extensions above existing extensions are often acceptable if there is a punctuating gap between the eaves height and the top of the extension. The SPD also advises, however, that on the upper floors, the extension should be sympathetic to the terrace.
7. Where there is existing variation in the rear elevations, the SPD advises that extensions above existing rear projections will normally be acceptable if they are visibly below the lowest point of the roof. However, the SPD also states that extensions that project beyond the original back line of existing rear extensions above ground floor will normally be unacceptable where they: interrupt a consistent arrangement/rhythm and/or inappropriately dominate the garden/the main building. Against that background, it seems to me that the balance of the guidance in the SPD is tipped against the appeal scheme.
8. Reference is made to several examples of other properties with first floor extensions to existing outriggers, with background details and photographs provided. While I have carefully considered each of the cases cited, none are within the same terrace as No 9, which provides the context within which the proposal would be visually 'read'. To briefly reiterate, it is the relationship of the proposal to the host building and the wider terrace that is objectionable in this case. From the information provided, I am not convinced that the precise circumstances raised in this case are the same or very similar to those identified. Even if the Council has been inconsistent in its decision-taking, and there are extensions in the same terrace as No 9 that have a significant visual impact, these are insufficient reasons to allow this appeal.
9. On the main issue, I conclude that the proposed development would materially harm the character and appearance of the local area. Accordingly, it is contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of The London Plan, Policy CS 8 of Islington's Core Strategy and Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies. These policies aim to ensure that development achieves a high quality of design that is appropriate to its context and reflects and positively contributes to local character and distinctiveness of an area. The proposal also conflicts with the SPD and the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which require that development is sympathetic to local character and add to the overall quality of the area.
10. Once complete, the proposal would provide a larger bedroom that, unlike the existing bedroom, would exceed the appropriate minimum space standard. It would improve the living conditions of the appellant and this family. However, this consideration does not outweigh the significant harm that I have identified.
11. An interested party raises additional concern in relation to the effect of the proposal on daylight, outlook, precedent and the potential for noise and disturbance during construction works. These are important matters and I have

considered all the evidence before me. However, given my findings on the main issue these are not matters that have been critical to my decision.

Conclusion

12. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan, as a whole. There are no material considerations, including the Framework, which indicate that the decision should be taken otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.
13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR