

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 December 2016

by P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 3rd January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/16/3155823

74 Axminster Road, Islington, London N7 6BS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Van Telleken against the decision of Islington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P2016/1269/FUL, dated 31 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is a loft conversion which has been designed to convert the existing loft space with restricted head height into a habitable space by raising the existing height and adding a rear mansard overlooking the rear of the property, being respectful of the existing butterfly detail of the existing roof layout. The front of the property has been designed with a proposed front slope that will run parallel to a projected sight line of a pedestrian from the opposite side of the street, taking great care to make sure that the proposed roof and rooflights are not visible.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. The proposal would result in a mansard roof extension behind the existing parapet of this dwelling. The house forms part of a uniform terrace of properties which have retained their original form and detailing. The front parapet is a clear and distinct feature which provides the street with its unified appearance and character. Although the new mansard would not be visible from directly in front of the property, it is the longer views, along the street, that are of more significance with regard to its wider character.
 4. Although the appellant suggests that the front chimney stacks would not be increased in height, the plans illustrate that they would. The mansard would be at a level just below the existing tops of the chimney pots and these are evident in longer views along the street from the opposite pavement. The upper line of the mansard roof and the raised party walls and chimneys would therefore be apparent in such views. The design seeks to minimise the prominence of the roof structure but given the particularly uniform roofs and unbroken parapets of these properties, on both sides of the road, new
-

- elements, visible above the existing parapet, would detract from the existing character and appearance of the area.
5. The backs of these properties are also of a very uniform and distinctive period design. The proposal takes this into account, to some extent, by retaining the rear chimney stacks and angling the lower section of the extension to retain an element of the butterfly roof structure. The limited set back of the higher works would however result in the addition being relatively prominent, particularly from the rear of properties on Sussex Way. Although this dwelling is perhaps a sufficient distance away to limit its impact on the views of the backs of these properties from Tollington Way, I do not find the limited set back of the rear element to be a positive feature of the design.
 6. Reference has been made to other developments in the vicinity. The two properties close to the junction with Tollington Way differ in a number of ways and provide a clear terminus to this terrace rather than appearing as an integral part of it. The roof structure midway along Axminster Road, close to the junction with Manor Gardens, appears to be set much further back from the parapet but is still evident, particularly from Manor Gardens. No details of the Sussex Way additions have been provided and the Council have not had an opportunity to comment on the references to them within the appeal statement. I am unclear as to when any of these additions were permitted. No details have been provided with regard to the applications referred to at 88 Prebend Street and 23 Linton Street other than a photograph within the appeal statement.
 7. I am not persuaded that the Council acted inconsistently when considering this proposal. I must, in any event, consider it on its own merits and in light of current development plan policies. However, given the similarity of the properties on both sides of this road and the uniformity of the terraces, the lack of comparable additions weighs against the proposal. Overall, the works would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area.
 8. The development would conflict with the design objectives of Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan; Policy CS8(A) of Islington's Core Strategy 2011; and Policy DM2.1 of the Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2013. As these policies generally accord with the design requirements of the *National Planning Policy Framework*, I afford them considerable weight. The examples provided do not suggest that an approach that would be at odds with the development plan should be adopted.
 9. Section 2.4.2 of the Supplementary Planning Document: Islington Urban Design Guide 2006 advises that a single roof extension can undermine the unity of an otherwise uniform terrace. It also advises that rear butterfly or valley roofs are particularly important features. It goes on to suggest that a break in a largely unaltered roofline is likely to have an adverse impact on the quality of the private realm. Section 2.4.3 advises that where the original roofline has been broken, the extent and nature of the existing roof additions will determine the scope for further change. A single roof extension that pre-dates the development plan on an otherwise unbroken roofline will not normally constitute a precedent for further roof additions. Although the design guide offers some support for the detail of the front mansard, it offers no support for the principle of this development in these particular circumstances.

10. I have considered all the matters put forward by the appellant, including the benefits of the additional accommodation and the potential to incorporate high standards with regard to its insulation. However, these matters are not sufficient to outweigh my concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR