
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 18 August 2025

by **K Williams MTCP (Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3364103

117 Hornsey Road, Islington, London N7 6DP

- 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 AGOC 01 LTD against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2024/2993/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a two-storey side extension and alteration to shop frontages.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3364104

117 Hornsey Road, Islington, London N7 6DP

- 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 AGOC 01 LTD against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/0051/FUL.
 - The development proposed is a side extension and mansard extension and alteration to shop frontages.
-

Decision

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. They differ mainly in the detail of the design of the proposed extensions. In particular for Appeal A the extension incorporates a flat roof. Appeal B includes a mansard roof over the proposed extension and existing building at 117 Hornsey Road. To avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. The description of development in Appeal A and Appeal B are taken from the planning application form. They both differ from the description on the Council's decision notices, but there is no evidence a change was agreed.

Main Issues

5. The main issues in respect of both appeals is the effect of the proposals on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located on the corner of Hornsey Road and Tollington Road at a prominent, busy and wide four-way road junction. It comprises the end building in

a row of traditional three storey terraces. The appeal building has a single storey side and rear extension. This is set back from the front building elevation and runs alongside the pavement on Tollington Road.

7. The appeal building differs from others in the row, in that it has commercial units and shop fronts at ground floor. However, there is a strong architectural cohesiveness to the surrounding built environment in terms of width, height, form, building line and pattern of fenestration. Although there may be missing architectural features on some buildings, the regimented building line and uniformity of the buildings and their relationship with each other creates a strong sense of place and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the immediate and wider area.
8. The existing single storey side extension is slightly at odds with the grain of the area. It encroaches significantly in front of the building line of properties on Tollington Road. The Tollington Public House on the opposite corner of Hornsey Road and Tollington Road is a tall grand building. It largely respects the form of the surrounding buildings and the building line on the opposing side of Tollington Road. This allows the beginning of the distinctive straight pattern of the buildings fronting both sides of Tollington Road to be appreciated, and there is a pleasing symmetry to the arrangement of buildings on both side of Tollington Road. This can be viewed across the busy Hornsey Road junction. The spacing and view acts as a transition between the buildings from one road to the other. Although it is not as elegant as the traditional buildings, the existing single storey element on the appeal building allows views above it towards the characteristic of this streetscene.
9. At present, the current Tollington Road elevation is lower in scale from the principal corner building. Both of the proposed side extensions would be as wide as the existing single storey side element. Although they would be slightly narrower than the host building, at three storeys, the proposals would introduce a large blank elevation, substantially increasing the height, massing and presence of the building in the street-scene. The increased size of the proposal would, immediately adjacent to the footway, give an uncharacteristic sense of overbearing and overdominance, particularly in comparison to the wider character and appearance of the opposing side of Tollington Road.
10. The side extensions would also appreciably reduce the openness at the corner and limit the views along the norther side of Tollington Road. It would be significantly more noticeable that the proposals were projecting in front of other buildings. The legibility of the existing grain of the area would be diminished. At this busy wide junction this would appear as an incongruous form of development.
11. In respect of Appeal A and Appeal B, the proposal reflects key architectural features of the host building and surrounding properties. However, the extensions would both be slightly narrower and could in some views appear slightly awkward and constrained given the very regimented external appearance of the terraces, and the endeavoured replication of the external fenestration, which is seen on wider buildings. The set-back would also mark it as different from the row of terraces and at the proposed height would compromise its strong regular appearance of the host building.
12. In addition to the above, the mansards proposed for Appeal B, would be distinctly at odds with the predominantly flat roof of the host terrace building. I note the

mansard roofs on nearby properties on Tollington Road and on the host terrace are relatively discrete. However, on this prominent corner plot, on a largely unaltered roof, the amalgamation across two buildings with the addition of projecting dormer windows would create an awkward and uncommon arrangement. The set-back of the building it would potentially make it a more visible feature, particularly as the wider junction allows views across to it.

13. I have not been provided with the plans of the approved planning application¹ at No 117. It is therefore not possible for me to make a comparison. Nor am I certain that the permission is still extant. Although there have been approved additions at 73 Hornsey Road, it is a different design of building. The character of that area is more varied. The property is also not as prominent or exposed as the appeal site before me. The example provided for 133 Hornsey Road is flush with the front face of the building, it does not look significantly different to its neighbours and it does project in front of the buildings on Arthur Road. However, it is narrower than the proposals before me. It is also not in such a prominent corner location. I also do not have details of when this was built or if it benefitted from planning permission. Therefore, although there are variations in corner buildings the above examples are not sufficiently similar to alter my view.
14. The approach to the external appearance of the proposals is respectful of the character of the area, and the addition of the traditional shop fronts facing Hornsey Road would be a visual benefit. I also appreciate that the site is not in a conservation area or near a listed building. However, the Council's policies are not restricted to suitable design only in those circumstances.
15. I therefore conclude for the reasons given above that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the area. The proposal would be contrary to Policy Plan 1 of Islington's Strategic and Development Management Policies (2023) and Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021). Together and insofar as they are relevant to the proposal, these require, amongst other things, for development to be of a high quality design that enhances local context and positively respond to local distinctiveness. For similar reasons, the proposal would not align with the guidance in paragraph 135 of The Framework. The proposal would also not fully align with guidance contained in the Urban Design Guide, Supplementary Planning Document 2017, which sets out urban design principles in relation to side extensions, and in respect of Appeal B mansard roofs.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

16. The proposal would result in enhanced living accommodation. There would be economic benefits from the construction and occupancy of the building. However, I have no evidence that the proposals are for any specific end users, and the benefits are not clearly quantified. Overall, due to the scale of the proposal, the benefits are likely to be limited. However, the harm to character and appearance of the area attracts significant weight and would not be outweighed.
17. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeals should be dismissed.

K Williams INSPECTOR

¹ P2020/0825/FUL

Appendix 1

List of those who have appealed

Reference	Case Reference	Appellant
Appeal A	APP/V5570/W/25/3364103	AGOC 01 LTD
Appeal B	APP/V5570/W/25/3364104	AGOC 01 LTD