
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 September 2017

by J D Westbrook BSc(hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/17/3180442

61 St. Georges Avenue, Islington, London, N7 0AJ

- 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 George Gooderham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2017/1095/FUL, dated 13 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2017.
 - The development proposed is the installation of a rooflight to the front roofslope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed rooflight on the character and appearance of the Tufnell Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No 61 is a three-storey, mid-terraced house situated on the southern side of St. Georges Avenue. St Georges Avenue lies within the Tufnell Park Conservation Area (CA). The proposed development would involve the installation of a rooflight, some 1.1 metres wide by 1.4 metres deep, in the front roofslope of the property.
4. Policy DM2.1 of the Council's Development Management Policies Document (DMP) indicates that development should respect and respond positively to existing buildings, the streetscape and the wider context including local architectural language and character, surrounding heritage assets and local distinctive patterns of development. The Tufnell Park CA Design Guidelines (SPG) states that on properties with exposed pitched roofs, new or enlarged dormers or rooflights will not be permitted on the front slopes.
5. The appellant points to the existence of similar rooflights on the front roofslopes of certain of the houses immediately opposite, and also on the front roofslope of the nearby No 69. I note his point and have a degree of sympathy with his situation. However, it would appear that these rooflights may have been installed before the introduction of an Article 4(2) Direction in the area, which removes the permitted development rights that would normally exist for such rooflights. Furthermore, whilst relatively small and in a high position, they do have some harmful visual impact on the roofscape along the road, which is otherwise largely uncluttered by such installations.

6. The Council notes that an earlier permission for developments on the roof of No 36 St. Georges Avenue precluded front rooflights by way of condition, and that a retrospective application for front rooflights on No 3 was refused and the decision upheld on appeal. The inspector in that appeal case indicated that roof lights are not a typical feature of the houses in St. Georges Avenue and that where such developments existed they detracted from the clean lines of the roofs set between protruding party walls. He continued that the roofs are an important part of the character of the buildings and, therefore, of the CA, and that adding further rooflights would diminish the quality of the streetscape.
7. I concur with the views of the earlier inspector, and consider that the proposed rooflight would be detrimental to the generally uncluttered roofscape along the length of St. Georges Avenue. Furthermore, whilst every proposal must be assessed on its own merits, to allow this development could encourage the submission of further similar proposals which would be progressively more difficult for the Council to resist, and which could cause cumulative harm to the general streetscape and the character and appearance of the CA.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA, and that it would conflict with Policy DM2.1 of the DMP and with the guidelines in the SPG. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR