



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 June 2024

by S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th July 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/23/3331635

Flat A, 24 Pyrland Road, Islington, London N5 2JD

- 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 O Ruggieri against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2023/2052/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a second floor rear extension above the existing two-storey outrigger with associated new outdoor amenity space at rear third floor level with associated railings.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was revised in December 2023. Accordingly, for the purposes of this decision I have referred to the latest version of the Framework. As the changes do not materially affect the main issues in this case, the parties have not been invited to make further comments.
3. On 28 September 2023 the Council adopted the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies (2023) (SDMP). Policy CS8 of the Islington Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2.1 3 of the Islington Development Management Policies (2013), which are referred to in the Council's decision notice, have therefore been superseded by SDMP Policy PLAN1.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a maisonette that occupies the first and second floors of a terrace house, 24 Pyrland Road. It is situated in a residential street comprising handsome terraces of similar age and appearance. The properties closest to Newington Green Road are accessed via steps from the street and have hipped roofs, whilst those further from the main road have entrance

doors at street level and butterfly roofs. 22 Pyrland Road forms one end of the taller terrace whereas No.24 forms one end of the lower terrace.

6. The differentiation in height and arrangement is evident from the rear where there is also a marked contrast in respect of the design and scale of the outriggers. The part of the terrace of which the appeal property forms part features 2 and 3-storey paired outriggers with mirrored pitched roofs. This gives this rear elevation a relatively uniform appearance, a matter to which I attach significant weight.
7. The proposal would comprise the erection of a second-floor rear extension above the outrigger. This would have a flat roof surrounded by railings to enable the formation of an additional roof terrace. Due to its height and form this would severely disrupt the symmetry between the appeal property and its paired neighbour, No.26, and would be an overly prominent and incongruous addition that would be out of keeping with the section of terrace of which the appeal property forms part.
8. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building. It therefore fails to comply with SDMP Policy PLAN1 which states that all forms of development are required to be of a high quality and make a positive contribution to local character, legibility and distinctiveness, based upon an understanding and evaluation of the defining characteristics of an area. There is also conflict with the aims of the Framework and the Islington Urban Design Guide (2017). The latter I note states that many terraces have paired additions with consistent rooflines and new extensions above these types of rear projections can disrupt the natural rhythm of rear elevations and should, therefore, be avoided.
9. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to the characteristics of its immediate context, I attribute limited weight to the rear extensions and roof terraces in the wider area referred to by the appellant, many of which I note may have been in place for many years.
10. As the appeal property forms part of a house that has been converted into 2 separate dwellings, I attach limited weight to what may have been possible under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 had No.24 remained a single dwellinghouse.
11. I note that the Council has taken the view that the proposal would not result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents and there have been no objections to the proposal. These matters do not outweigh the clear harm outlined above.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR