



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th October 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3253585
20 Cruikshank Street, London WC1X 9HF

- 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 Mark Fleet against the decision of the London Borough of Islington Council.
 - The application Ref P2020/0100/FUL, dated 18 February 2020, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2020.
 - The development proposed is Alterations to existing residential property including rear dormer, rooflights and alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural and Preliminary Matters

2. The Council confirmed that there was a typographical error within their reason for refusal as instead of Policy DM2.3 of the Islington Development Management Policies 2013, policy DM3.3 was misquoted. The appellant is aware of this error and therefore I am satisfied the interests of the party has not been prejudiced.
3. The appellant proposes amendments to the plans that were previously considered by the Council and these have been included with the appellant's Statement of Case. I have taken account these plans as part of my assessment.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the dwelling and the character and appearance of the New River Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a purpose built residential building consisting of a maisonette arrangement of ground floor and first floor flat, both accessed via their own independent front doors and is semi-detached and two-stories. The rear is accessed via a narrow side passage between the pairs of semi's that leads to a communal path and rear gardens.
6. Cruikshank Street is a short street of both identical flatted development and terraced residential dwellings, as well as more modern detached houses. New River CA is characterised by 18th and early 19th Century residential estates with

- fine terraces and squares. Consistency of scale, materials, design and detailing are in evidence across the CA.
7. Numbers 16-25 Cruikshank Street make up the row of identical properties on the north side of the street. These, and the identical properties opposite, retain a significant amount of original character. An anomaly to the pairs of semi's along the appeal site row is the addition of a single roof light to the front elevation and another to the side elevation of No 24/25. This detracts from the otherwise unaltered roofscape, although I understand these were permitted some time ago.
 8. Whilst roof lights may provide internal benefits for the occupiers, as proposed to the front elevation, they would be highly visible and would further interrupt and distort this otherwise streamlined roof vista.
 9. Window W5 is proposed to be reduced with the use of a new upvc window. Despite the evidence of an existing upvc window at the site, it is not a traditional material to use within a property of historic merit. Despite its location away from public views, a new window of smaller dimensions, would not preserve or enhance the special historic qualities of the dwelling.
 10. A rear dormer is apparent to the attached property. The proposed dormer is significantly different in its scale and massing and would add considerable bulk to the roof elevation. Regardless of its design quality, it would not be a sympathetic addition to the roof plane. Whilst it may not be widely visible from beyond the rear elevations of the row, nonetheless, it would damage the historic integrity of the roof form.
 11. Chimney stacks and pots are an integral part of the fabric of the street and the CA as a whole. Whilst it is evident that pots have been removed from some of the properties and chimney stacks reduced in heights to other dwellings, this erosion is harmful to the unity of the appeal property and the wider CA. The removal of chimney to the side wall would be harmful to the symmetry with the attached dwellings. The loss of such would diminish the original characteristics of the appeal property and would thus be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA.
 12. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with the Islington Core Strategy 2011 Policies CS8 and CS9 to enhance and protect the area's character and historic environment, and the Islington Development Management Policies 2013 Urban Design Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 in their aims for development to make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, and to preserve and enhance the historic environment. Furthermore, it would conflict with the advice contained within the Islington Urban Design Guide 2017 and the Conservation Area Design Guidelines 2002. Finally, it would not meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework seeking to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Other Matters

13. Modern contemporary houses are located along Cruikshank Street. They do not relate to the characteristics of the appeal property and are therefore not comparable.

14. The appellant suggests that a metal crittal window could be used at window W7 and to relocate W8. However, as I am dismissing the appeal, there is no requirement to consider these matters.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR