
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 August 2019

by T J Burnham BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3227750

Flat 1b, Waymouth Villas, Moray Road, Islington, London N4 3LE

- 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 Allan Olsen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/0354/FUL, dated 28 January 2019, was refused by notice dated 26 March 2019.
 - The development proposed is insertion of rooflights to rear elevation of main roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The works have been carried out and I am satisfied that these broadly accord with the submitted drawings, I am considering the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the rooflights on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site sits within the Tollington Park Conservation Area (the conservation area). As detailed within the Islington Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002) (ICADG) the predominant character is residential and the area has an above average standard of architectural design. The form, materials and detailing of the buildings are defining features of its character and appearance.
5. The appeal property sits in a terraced group with two other properties of similar design and attractive appearance. Other than a front roof feature relating to the bay window, their pitched roof slopes are simple in appearance, with a predominance of roofing material over other features. The evidence indicates that both 2 and 3 Waymouth Villas each have three individual rooflights to their rear roof slopes and that a similar scheme was granted consent at the appeal property in recent times.
6. The appeal scheme is significantly different to that consented. Five rooflights have been added to the rear roof slope of the appeal property. Four of these are clustered together, while a fifth larger roof light sits adjacent to this group.

7. The group of four rooflights result in a large concentrated glazed area which dominates the rear roof-slope, therefore they appear considerably at odds with and disruptive to the rhythm of the relatively simple and ordered rear roof slopes on Waymouth Villas.
8. The rectangular proportion of the single rooflight is at odds with the proportions of windows on Waymouth Villas which have a vertical emphasis. This rooflight therefore forms an incongruous feature.
9. Whilst the rooflights are of limited projection from the roofslope, coloured to match the roofing materials, and appear well made, the appeal proposal for the reasons above detracts from the heritage significance of the conservation area which lies in part with the form, materials and detailing of the buildings.
10. I accept that views of the rooflights are taken only from the private realm, in the main from rear elevations and gardens of properties on Tollington Park. I deem the harm to the significance of the conservation area to be less than substantial. Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that this harm should be weighed against any public benefits of the proposal.
11. The benefits of this scheme would likely be limited to the provision of improved light levels within the appeal property over those that would be afforded in relation to the consented scheme. However, any benefit would primarily be a personal one for the appellant. Given the degree of harm I have found that would arise from the appeal scheme and the statutory protection afforded to conservation areas, such benefit would not be sufficient to outweigh this harm.
12. The proposal would therefore be contrary to saved Policy CS 9 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013) which seek high quality design which protects the historic environment. It would also be contrary to the guidance of the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) where it relates to rooflights.

Other Matters

13. Whilst the appeal proposal does not include 'roof extensions or dormer windows visible from any street view' which are specifically ruled out at this address by the ICADG, it cannot be inferred that any other roof alteration would consequently be acceptable.
14. Whilst no objections have been received from nearby occupiers, the absence of objections does not inevitably indicate an absence of harm. The Council clearly sets out why it considers the application unacceptable and as can be seen from my above findings, I concur with this view.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

T J Burnham

INSPECTOR