



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 November 2024

by E Catcheside BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st November 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/24/3346929

367 Flat A, Holloway Road, Islington, London N7 0RN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Jennifer Kane against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2023/3473/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the installation of thermal shutters to existing rear windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of thermal shutters to existing rear windows at 367 Flat A Holloway Road, Islington, London N7 0RN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2023/3473/FUL, the unnumbered plan entitled 367A Holloway Road Location Plan, and the plan numbered 367A-01.

Preliminary Matters

2. The evidence indicates that the description of the development was changed with the appellant's agreement. I have therefore taken the description of the development from the decision notice, insofar as it describes development.
3. The application was submitted retrospectively. On my site visit, I observed that the shutters have been installed in accordance with the submitted plans. I have therefore considered the appeal on the basis of the submitted evidence as well as my observations of the development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms part of a three-storey terraced row, which comprises dwellings above commercial units. The dwellings have access to a rear terrace, which overlooks a commercial service yard.
6. The Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (January 2017) (SPD) notes that solid security shutters on commercial properties contribute to a poor-quality environment because they are visually unsightly, prevent natural surveillance, attract graffiti, obscure the shopfront and window display, and create hostile and unsafe streets.

7. However, unlike typical commercial security shutters, the appeal shutters are modest in size and are of a neutral shade, which broadly reflects the light colour of the lintels on some neighbouring dwellings. Moreover, they have a discrete appearance due to their close fit to each window, which allows them to integrate sympathetically with the character of the host property and the wider terraced row.
8. The shutters open and close as required to regulate the internal environment, much like commonly used domestic internal window coverings. Therefore, natural surveillance would be maintained in a similar manner to other residential properties in the area. Furthermore, because the shutters are not publicly accessible, it is unlikely they would be subject to graffiti. The shutters do not present to a prominent street frontage, and views from the service yard are at an oblique angle, due to the set back of the property behind the ground floor rear elevation. Consequently, the shutters are not readily observed from public views, and they do not create a hostile environment or unsafe streets.
9. The site lies outside of, but close to, the Hillmarton Conservation Area (CA). There is no substantive evidence before me to suggest the development is visible from the CA. Due to the small-scale of the development, and the presence of the intervening service yard and buildings, I am satisfied that no harm would be caused to the significance of the CA through development within its setting.
10. Overall, I conclude the development has not caused harm to the character and appearance of the area. Therefore, there is no conflict with Policies D3 and D4 of The London Plan (March 2021) (LonP), and Policy PLAN1 of the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies (September 2023) which, together, seek high quality design that positively responds to local character and distinctiveness. There would also be no conflict with Policy HC1 of the LonP, which seeks to conserve the significance of heritage assets.

Conditions

11. The Council suggested conditions requiring the development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted plans and documents. The development has been constructed in accordance with the plans, and therefore the conditions are unnecessary. Because the development has already been carried out, it is also not necessary to include the standard time limit condition. No further conditions are necessary to make the development acceptable.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

E Catchside

INSPECTOR