



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 January 2026

by **P Storey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/25/3376120

70 Kingsdown Road, Islington, London N19 4LW

- 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 Hugh Queenan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/2066/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as: "Householder application. Additional storey to existing family home to match predominant building height along street. New external wall insulation and render, with alterations to windows throughout. Amendments to front facade to include new entrance porch and alterations to front garden including new air source heat pump."
-

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 property is the end dwelling within a two-storey terrace of modest 20th century houses, with simple design and tiled pitched roofs (Nos 70 to 80). Immediately adjoining it, No 68 marks the end building of an earlier, taller 3-storey terrace, characterised by typical London vernacular features including a prominent ground-floor bay window, large upper-floor sash windows, and a pitched roof concealed behind a parapet. The opposite end of the 20th century terrace is similarly bookended by a terrace of earlier 3-storey dwellings, albeit displaying their own distinctive detailing.
4. Notwithstanding its comparatively simple architectural form, the host terrace reads as a coherent and legible composition with a uniform two-storey height and unbroken front roofline. The clarity and consistency of this modest frontage provides a counterpoint to the more articulated architectural detailing of the adjoining period development. In that way, the host terrace makes a positive contribution to local character by reinforcing the contrast between different periods of development while maintaining visual order.
5. Policy PLAN1 of the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies, September 2023 (the LP) requires high-quality design that responds to and enhances context and makes a positive contribution to local character, legibility and distinctiveness. The Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning

Document, January 2017 (the UDG) emphasises the importance of rhythm, scale and proportions, and the importance of rooflines to terrace character. Outside conservation areas, the UDG allows scope for roof extensions that disrupt a consistent roofline, but only where they are designed appropriately to the host building.

6. The appeal site lies at a transition point between distinct architectural styles, where the lower, recessive two-storey terrace sits purposefully against the taller, earlier development. However, rather than articulating this relationship, the proposed additional storey would rise above the established two-storey form and compete with both the scale and visual presence of No. 68, diminishing the established hierarchy that currently emphasises the qualities of the earlier architecture.
7. Even though Nos 70 to 80 effectively represent a deviation from the older three-storey pattern, the resulting streetscape is of a uniform two-storey terrace that is positively framed by the distinctive taller proportions and articulation of the period terraces. Introducing a competing three-storey form at the very end of the lower terrace would dilute this relationship. On that basis, the scheme would not represent the kind of context-sensitive design supported by PLAN1 or the UDG.
8. Furthermore, the proposed rendered front, combined with a markedly altered fenestration pattern and increased height, would present an assertive, contemporary expression at the book-end of a short, uniform terrace. Whilst contemporary interpretation can be appropriate in certain contexts, the proposal would detract from the recessive role the group currently plays in the composition of the street, thus appearing uncharacteristic.
9. To the rear, where the existing streetscape is already varied due to extensions and alterations, the visual effect of the proposed development would be less pronounced. The removal of the chimney, as has already taken place at neighbouring properties, would represent a minor alteration that would not, in itself, be harmful, nor is there substantive evidence that such works would require separate consent if undertaken independently. However, the lack of harm in these terms would be neutral factors that would not weigh in favour of the proposal.
10. I have considered the examples of other development cited by the appellant, including the nearby example at 73 Kingsdown Road, and other examples of variation between form, scale and architectural style. However, each decision must be taken with regard to its specific context and circumstances, which can vary even between closely related sites. In this case, the main determinative factors are the consistency of the host terrace and the role it plays in the transitional context of the street. Accordingly, despite the cited examples displaying some similarities to the appeal proposal, they do not persuade me to depart from my previous findings.
11. For these reasons, by virtue of its siting, design, form, massing, bulk and height, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and would conflict with LP Policy PLAN1 and the provisions of the UDG, the aims of which have previously been set out. It would also conflict with the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which have similar aims.

Other Matters

12. The proposed development would incorporate sustainability measures intended to improve energy performance and efficiency, including external insulation, improved glazing, photovoltaic panels and an air source heat pump. Such measures accord in principle with the aims of the development plan and the Framework, attracting moderate weight in favour of the proposal.
13. Whilst a larger dwelling might better meet the needs of occupiers and could marginally improve housing choice, these are private or limited public benefits. Additionally, the scheme would not create an additional dwelling and therefore carries no weight in terms of considerations of housing land supply. Taken together with the sustainability benefits, these considerations do not outweigh the harm identified to character and appearance and the resulting conflict with the development plan.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P Storey

INSPECTOR