
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2023

by Gary Deane BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/22/3312885

7 Hope Close, Islington, London N1 2YS

- 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 Chris Peacock against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2022/2273/FUL, dated 14 June 2022, was refused by notice dated 5 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a full-width ground floor extension with part-width first floor rear extension and roof terrace; new windows to the ground floor side elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a full-width ground floor extension with part-width first floor rear extension and roof terrace; new windows to the ground floor side elevation at 7 Hope Close, Islington, London N1 2YS in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P2022/2273/FUL, dated 14 June 2022, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Procedural matters

2. The site falls within the Canonbury Conservation Area (CA). Accordingly, I have paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA, as required by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
3. While the appellant has described the proposal as in the above heading, the submitted plans additionally show the conversion of the integral garage to living accommodation and new windows to both the side and rear elevations of No 7. I have assessed the appeal scheme on that basis.

Main issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the local area, bearing in mind the statutory duty outlined above.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a modern 3-storey end terrace dwelling that lies within a predominantly residential area. I saw that the other 2 properties in the same terrace as No 7 have been extended and externally altered at the rear. As a

result, there is some variety to the built form and general appearance of the terrace to which the appeal dwelling belongs.

6. The CA covers a large area and is also mainly residential in character. To my mind, the CA derives its significance as a designated heritage asset largely from the architectural quality of the historic buildings within it and the regular and repeating patterns of terraces, with their matching styles and materials, that form well-mannered streetscapes. From what I observed, there is much greater variation in the built form at the rear of buildings in the CA partly due to various external changes that have been carried out. The short terrace of which No 7 forms part is one such example.
7. The proposal is primarily to enlarge No 7 by erecting a part single storey, part 2-storey flat roof rear extension with a small first floor terrace enclosed by a glazed balustrade. As the appeal scheme would be at the back of the host building, away from the road, it would have no discernible effect on the character and qualities of the local street scene.
8. The proposal would noticeably add to the scale and bulk of the appeal dwelling at the rear with the top of the new extension terminating just below the eaves of the host building. This arrangement would draw the proposal into a conflict with some of the guidance in the Council's Urban Design Guide (UDG). The UDG states that rear extensions should be no higher than one full storey below the eaves to ensure they are sufficiently subordinate to the main building.
9. Nevertheless, the new first floor addition would be set back from the rear and sidewalls of the new ground floor extension. As such, the new rear façade would have a stepped profile, which would visually 'breakup' its scale and bulk. In addition, the new first floor element would not cover the entire width of the main building with a punctuating gap retained between the main eaves and the top of the new extension. When seen from the back garden of No 7 and those of neighbouring properties, the proposal would appear as a proportionate addition. It would not draw the eye as overly tall, large or bulky given the substantial built form and height of the host building and the wider terrace. Taken together with appropriate external materials, as proposed, and a consistent pattern of fenestration to unify the overall design, the proposed rear extension would be sympathetic with, and subordinate to, the host building, in compliance with the guidance in the UDG.
10. The finished rear elevation would differ to other properties in the same terrace that do not include built extensions at first floor level. Even so, each of these adjacent properties has a large full width ground floor rear extension with a terrace on the flat roof above that adds scale and height to the projection. Given the varied context within which the proposal would be seen, no undue visual dominance or disharmony would result since any strong sense of unity or rhythm across the rear façade of the terrace has already been disrupted by the changes that have taken place. By respecting the scale, design and general appearance of the host building and the character and qualities of the local area, the proposal would adhere to the key principles of the UDG. Therefore, I find that a conflict with some of the guidance within the UDG is insufficient reason to withhold planning permission.
11. With regard to the CA, as a whole, the rear elevations of properties contribute to the character and appearance of this designated area. However, the principal value of the CA is derived from its historic buildings and from the cohesive street frontages, which would be unaffected by the proposal. For the

reasons given, there would be no significant harm to the rear elevation of the appeal dwelling or the terrace to which it belongs. The Council appears to raise no objection to the conversion of the garage to provide additional living accommodation, the new side windows or to the replacement first floor rear window. From the evidence provided, I, too, find these elements of the appeal scheme acceptable. Taken together, I consider that the character and appearance of the CA would therefore be preserved.

12. Reference is made to rear extensions at 30 Napier Terrace and 46 Linton Street with some details and plans provided. In my experience, it is rare that direct parallels can be drawn between one case and another primarily because local circumstances often vary. In this case, Nos 30 and 46 are not situated in the same CA as the site nor from the drawings provided is the host building similar in style to that of No 7. In any event, a key planning principle is that each case should be assessed on its own merits. Having done so, I find that the proposal is acceptable for the reasons given.
13. On the main issue, I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building and the local area. As such, it does not conflict with Policies CS 8 and CS 9 of Islington's Core Strategy, Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies or the policies of the London Plan. These policies aim to ensure that development is high quality that positively contributes to local character and distinctiveness of an area and that safeguards heritage assets such as conservation areas. It would also comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, which states that development should be sympathetic to local character and protect or enhance heritage assets.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the development, a condition is imposed to require that the external materials match those of the existing building.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Gary Deane

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: Refs HOP 100, HOP 101, HOP 102, HOP 103, HOP 104, HOP 105, HOP 106, HOP 200 Revision B, HOP 201 Revision A, HOP 202 Revision A, HOP 203 Revision B, HOP 204 Revision A, HOP 205, HOP 206 Revision B, and the H.M. Land Registry Plan, which shows the site edged red.
- 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.