
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 May 2017

by Mike Worden BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 6th June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3168801

Canning House, Canning Road, Islington, London N5 2JS

- 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 and Mrs R. A. Lockhart against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/3618/FUL, dated 15 September 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is a roof top extension to provide additional living accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The appellant submitted an additional plan, LO15/162revp2, following the issuing of the Council's decision. I have taken this plan into account in reaching my decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the area, with particular regard to street-scene.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, Canning House, lies at the end of a long row of late Victorian houses. The appeal property is modern but through its design and use of materials is reasonably sympathetic to the remaining properties in the row. Although giving the appearance of a single detached two storey dwelling, Canning House is actually two dwellings, accessed through a communal front door.
 5. The side elevation of the appeal property is very visible in the street-scene as a result of it being at the end of the row, but also because it is close to the junction with Riversdale Road which is set at an angle to Canning Road. At the opposite end of street to the appeal property, Canning Road adjoins Mountgrove Road, where there are a number of commercial uses.
-

6. Canning Road is characterised by the straight line of its street pattern but also by the straight lines of the rows either side, the parapets of the house roofs which hide valley roofs behind, and the presence of valuable street trees.
7. Canning Road slopes gently uphill from Mountgrove Road and Canning House is set on slightly higher ground and is taller in design than its neighbouring property.
8. The proposed development would introduce a mansard roof extension with two dormer windows facing the front, and two facing the rear. The extension would provide additional living accommodation for both of the two dwellings within Canning House and has been designed in a symmetrical manner.
9. The extension would introduce a very different roof pattern from that which currently exists on Canning House and on the majority of the houses along the row. Currently Canning House has a parapet roofline to the front and side, and valleys behind, in keeping with the older properties in the row. The proposed development would break the generally unbroken roofline along the row and introduce a different form of roof line.
10. The extension would raise the roof by around 1.6m at eaves level and around 1.7m at its highest centre point. The extension would be significantly higher than that of the rest of the row in this part of Canning Road and would draw further attention to the breaking of the roofline and the characteristic pattern of the roof scape which currently exists. Canning House is at the end of the row and that its side elevation is prominent in views down the street from the junction with Riversdale Road, and this would lead to the extension appearing bulky and add to the sense of the characteristic roofline being broken.
11. To the rear, the design of the mansard roof respects and maintains the characteristic valley roof profile. The two dormer windows on the front elevation of the proposed extension are symmetrical in position to each other. However, they would be of a different design and out of alignment to the windows on the front elevation of the host dwelling. They also incorporate solid cheeks which make them less subordinate to the principal windows and draws attention to them in the streetscape.
12. These elements would jar with the existing fenestration detail of the host property and be contrary to the guidance set out in the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (the SPD) which seeks good design in roof extensions.
13. I consider therefore that the dormer windows as proposed would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling.
14. The SPD was approved by the Council subsequently to the issuing of the decision notice. At paragraph 5.153 there is a reference that outside of conservation areas there is scope to introduce roof extensions which are of high quality design and that where a street benefits from a consistent and unbroken roof line, then the extensions need to be designed in a style appropriate to the host building.
15. I have already concluded that by virtue of the design of the dormer windows, the proposed extension would be harmful to the appearance of the host dwelling and so would be contrary to paragraph 5.153 of the SPD.

16. Furthermore though, the provisions of the SPD need to be considered as a whole and it is clear from paragraphs 5.145-5.148 of the SPD that harmonisation with the predominant roofline and ensuring that extensions do not project significantly above or alter the prevailing roofline are important design considerations.
17. For the reasons which I have set out above, I consider that the proposed extension would project significantly above the prevailing roofline and break the pattern of the roofline along the row. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the area and would be contrary to Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan Development Management Local Plan Development Plan Document 2013 (the DPD) and Policies CS 8 and CS 9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011 (the CS) which together require development to be of good design and respect local character.
18. The proposed development would also be contrary to the SPD and paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which requires new development to be of good design.
19. The appellant has drawn my attention to the roof extension at number 58 Canning Road, planning permission for which was won on appeal¹ and was the subject of a judicial review². The development has been completed and I was able to see it on my site visit. I consider there are some significant differences between that development and this case, not only because of the changed policy position since 2003 and the publication of the Framework.
20. No. 58 Canning Road is on a corner site at the far end of Canning Road to the site of this appeal and its original design and relationship to the properties around it, including the commercial uses close to it on Mountgrove Road, are different to the current case. In any event, I have determined this case on its merits on the basis of the evidence before me.

Conclusion

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

Mike Worden

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/V5570/A/02/1106276

² Islington London Borough Council v First Secretary of State [2004] EWHC 430 (Admin)