



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 November 2025

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3373017

Flat 1, 24 Blythwood Road, Islington, London, N4 4EU

- 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 Mr George Agyekum of OA Property Solutions Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
- The application Ref is P2025/1215/FUL.
- The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension at Flat 1, 24 Blythwood Road, Islington, London, N4 4EU, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2025/1215/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing nos.: 25_02-P01 Location and Block Plan, 25_02-P30 Rev A Proposed Floor Plans, 25_02-P31 Rev A Proposed Elevation, and 25_02-P32 Rev A Proposed Elevation.
 - 3) The external materials of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the terrace it forms part of.

Reasons

3. The appeal property comprises a ground floor flat, set within a row of three-storey terraced properties. It has an existing flat roof extension to the rear, which spans just over half the width of the plot. Timber decking wraps around the rear extension with steps leading down to a generous garden. From on the decking and within the rear garden of the appeal property, I was able to see other rear extensions of varying heights, widths, depths, roof forms and in some cases roof terraces. The properties are by no means uniformed, particularly at the rear. Nor do the properties in this section of the terrace, which have a different roof form to others, have pairs of adjoining pitched roof rear outriggers.
4. I am advised that other large extensions in the area were approved under a previous local plan. Whilst that may be the case, they form part of the character

and appearance of the area, and I have not been advised that the policies relevant to the main issue in this case have significantly changed.

5. Blythwood Park Slopes upwards from Crouch Hill and the houses step up in line with the ground level. Consequently, the floor levels and window heights of the appeal property are higher than those of adjoining No.22. The rear gardens also slope downhill towards Holly Park, which is bound by a wide, steep, densely landscaped embankment. Despite the time of year, I was only able to see glimpsed views of the rear upper floors and roofs of the properties on Blythwood Road, from Holly Park, due to the difference in levels, the high boundary fences and the mature planting along both sides of the rear boundaries.
6. The proposal would infill a small gap between the existing flat roof rear extension and the boundary with No.22. Space would be retained between the original rear elevation and the extension, providing natural light and ventilation to what would become a bedroom. The extension would be slightly set back from the rear wall of the existing extension. The sloping roof would not be significantly higher than the existing boundary fence, and it would slope away from No. 22, with its highest point being no greater than the existing flat roof extension.
7. The openings in the rear of the existing and proposed extensions would have a vertical emphasis, albeit they would not align with the windows above, and accordingly these, along with the footprint and roof form, would further unbalance the symmetry of the original building and its fenestration. However, the roof form reflects the need to protect the living conditions of occupiers of No.22, and the extension would only be visible from very few private rear windows and gardens. Given the changes that have already been made to the rear of the building at ground floor level, and the limited visibility of this area, the further modest infill addition proposed, would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the terrace it forms part of.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would accord with Policy D4 of the London Plan (2021) and Policy PLAN1 of the Islington Strategic and Development Management Policies (2023), which seek amongst other things to ensure that new development responds positively to local character and delivers good design.

Conditions

9. Conditions specifying the standard time limit for commencing the development and listing the approved drawing numbers that the development must be carried out in accordance with, are necessary to provide certainty on these matters. A matching materials condition is necessary to ensure the development is in keeping with the appearance of the host building. The Council suggested a condition to prevent the flat roof from being used as a balcony, but no flat roof is proposed and as such this is not necessary.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR