



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 October 2023

by J Davis BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/ V5570/D/23/3327503

3 Aspen Close, Islington, London, N19 5XE

- 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 Richard O'Mahony against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2023/1123/FUL, dated 18 April 2023, was refused by notice dated 12 June 2023.
 - The development proposed is second floor roof extension to provide additional 1 bed and bathroom accommodation to the original terrace (C3) dwellinghouse.
-

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 host property, the wider terrace and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey, mid terrace dwelling that forms part of a large, planned estate which has a consistent and uniform built form and character. It adjoins other dwellings on three sides and forms part of a small inner courtyard of buildings accessed via an entrance from Hargrave Park. It adjoins a courtyard of a similar design, known as Alder Mews. The internal courtyard terraces are of a consistent design and are lower in height and visually subservient to the outer terraces along Hargrave Park and Bredgar Road.
4. The appeal property has been the subject of several previous planning applications as well as applications for prior approval works. Of particular relevance is an application for prior approval in 2021¹ for an additional storey above the dwellinghouse which was refused by the Council and dismissed on appeal. Following that appeal decision, the proposal has subsequently evolved further, with the overall height and scale of the extension significantly reduced.
5. The proposed roof extension would be constructed with slate tiles to match the existing roof materials. It would involve an altered roof arrangement and a modest increase in the height of the roof. In my view, the roof extension would

¹ P2021/2861/PRA

be of a bulky, box-like appearance which would detract from the uniformity created by the consistent scale and form of the courtyard dwellings and the low profile of the existing roofscape.

6. I find that the roof addition would be particularly apparent when approaching Aspen Close from Hargrave Park and when viewed from the small internal courtyard where it would appear as a visually dominant, imposing and incongruous addition to the existing dwelling and would detract from the wider roofscape of the terrace. The increase in height and the introduction of fenestration at roof level would also disrupt the unity of the terrace when viewed from the adjacent terraces to the rear.
7. Whilst wider views of the proposal would not be readily obtainable due to the higher buildings along the adjacent road frontages, this does not lessen my concern regarding the overall effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing dwelling, the cohesiveness and planned appearance of the wider terrace and the immediate area.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property, the wider terrace and the surrounding area. Thus, it would be contrary to Policy CS8 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011), Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013) and the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017). Collectively these policies and guidance require (amongst other matters) development to be of a high quality and to make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of an area.

Other Matters

9. I acknowledge the absence of local objections to the proposed development. However, this is not a determining factor as I have determined the appeal on its merits and have found that it would result in visual harm.
10. I also acknowledge that the proposed extension would provide additional accommodation for the appellant and his family. While I acknowledge the personal benefit this may represent, this is a matter which I afford limited weight.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Davis

INSPECTOR