



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 April 2025

by **A M Nilsson BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/24/3355643

Flat C, 2 Queensbury Street, Islington, London N1 3AD

- 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 Miss Hayley Davis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2024/0810.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a third and part fourth floor with roof terrace to a residential building and associated external alterations.
-

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 area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site forms part of a detached, three-storey residential block located on the corner of Queensbury Street and Ecclesbourne Road. It is adjacent to a three-storey terrace on Queensbury Street and five-storey building which fronts onto New North Road at the corner with Ecclesbourne Road. Elsewhere, opposite the appeal site on Ecclesbourne Road is a four-storey block of flats.
4. The proposed development would add an additional two storeys to the existing building. The proposed fourth storey would represent an almost upward continuation of the existing building in terms of its form and design. The proposed fifth storey would be set back from the additional fourth storey and would be of a different design and incorporate a roof terrace. Planning permission¹ has been granted separately for the proposed fourth storey.
5. Although the appeal building sits adjacent to a five-storey building, it forms part of the lower rise and more open built environment that sits behind the busier New North Road around Morton Road Park. Whilst from some viewpoints it is experienced visually in conjunction with the adjacent taller building, in others it is viewed more in isolation or in conjunction with the lower scale development of Queensbury Street. When combined with its prominent corner setting, the addition of a further two storeys to this standalone building will greatly increase its prominence where it would appear top-heavy and greatly exposed, despite the

¹ Planning Application Ref P2023/3348/FUL

proposed fifth storey being setback from the parapet. Furthermore, the increased height and bulk would appear notably taller than its immediate neighbours on Queensbury Street and this would jar in the street scene

6. The design of the additional floors also follows two conflicting styles. The fourth storey unashamedly replicates the rest of the building and this is consistent with the extant consent, whilst the fifth storey takes a more modern contemporary approach including through the use of zinc cladding. Whilst such a contrast in styles can produce a successful addition in certain instances, the proposed fifth floor includes a confused arrangement of details. For example, the combination of modern aluminium framed windows with timber sash windows to match those of the existing building, including the distinctive curve-topped window, would appear awkward and uncoordinated. Also, the use of a sloping section to part of the addition, but not to others, would appear discordant on a building with such a clear horizontal and vertical emphasis. The fifth-floor roof extension would appear as an incongruent and rather obvious later addition.
7. The proposed development would therefore cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy PLAN1 of the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies (2023) and Policies D3 and D4 of the London Plan (2021). These policies require, amongst other things, that developments are of a high-quality design and make a positive contribution to local character.
8. It would also be contrary to the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) which outlines, amongst other things, that roof extensions should be sympathetic to the host building, and even where there are variations in building heights, an alteration to an existing roofline is likely to be unacceptable where it adversely impacts on the public realm or the architectural integrity and quality of the existing or neighbouring buildings.

Other Matters

9. The appellant has referred to a potential fallback of development being undertaken at the appeal site under provisions of the General Permitted Development Order (the Order) which permits the construction of up to two additional storeys of new dwellinghouses on detached blocks of flats.
10. The benefit given by the Order is for the provision of new dwellinghouses, which is not the case here. Furthermore, any development under Class A is permitted subject to the condition that before beginning the development, the developer must apply to the local planning authority for prior approval of the authority as to, amongst other things, the external appearance of the building. No such prior approval has been granted at the appeal site and I therefore give this fallback limited weight in the appeal.
11. The appeal scheme would allow for an area of private outdoor amenity space where there is currently none. Although such a provision is not a requirement for a development proposal of this nature, it is a benefit of moderate weight in favour of the appeal, however it does not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the area.
12. I acknowledge that the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is supportive of upward development, however this is where such developments are

well-designed. For the reasons given above, this would not be the case with the appeal development.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan for the area when considered as a whole and there are no identified other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict.
14. For the reasons set out above, and having had regard to all other matters raised, I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

A M Nilsson

INSPECTOR