
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by Andrew Owen BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3245348

Flat 3, 104A Tufnell Park Road, Islington, London N7 0DU

- 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 Duncan Robertson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/3333/FUL, dated 6 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the extension of the top floor flat including construction of a new rear dormer window and side extension and construction of two new chimney stacks.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the extension of the top floor flat including construction of a new rear dormer window and side extension and construction of two new chimney stacks at Flat 3, 104A Tufnell Park Road, Islington, London N7 0DU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2019/3333/FUL, dated 6 November 2019, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: (000)001 Rev A, (100)005 Rev A, (100)010 Rev E, (100)011 Rev B, (100)012 Rev B, (300)010 Rev A, (300)011 Rev A and (300)012 Rev B.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeals Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Procedural Matter

3. The appellant has submitted an amended plan with the appeal, to correct a minor error on the previous plan showing the proposed side elevation. This amended plan was not considered by the Council in their determination of the planning application. However, as the amended plan would not change the proposed development, the Council and any interested parties would not be prejudiced by my acceptance of it. I have therefore considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, semi-detached pair of dwellings and the surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

5. The appeal property is a three-storey semi-detached dwelling which has been divided into three flats. It is within an urban residential location which is mainly comprised of other three-storey dwellings, both terraced and semi-detached. The uniformity of the design of the houses, particularly the terraces, is a strong characteristic of the streetscene. However, the appeal property, with its semi-detached partner, does vary from this uniformity, including at roof level by virtue of the front facing dormers. The proposal is a roof extension creating two dormers, one on the rear elevation and one on the side elevation. Two traditionally designed chimney stacks would also be constructed on the side elevation, in front of the proposed side dormer.
6. The dormer on the rear elevation of the dwelling would have a pitched roof which would not match other rear dormers in the area that largely have flat roofs, including the dormer at the adjoining semi-detached house at No.102A. However, due to its limited visibility from the street, this would not be apparent in the wider area and its design would not be so significantly different to be out of keeping with the neighbouring property or surrounding area in a way which would be unacceptable.
7. Even though the rear dormer would be slightly larger than the neighbouring dormer at No.102A, it would not appear excessively large in size and would fit well on the existing roof slope. The glazing on it would not match that of the rest of the property. However, as it is modest in size and a stand-alone dormer rather than an additional storey, it is not considered that this would appear incongruous or out of keeping with the existing dwelling to an extent which would result in harm.
8. The proposed dormer on the side elevation would be somewhat visible in the streetscene, however this would be largely obscured by the proposed chimney stacks, which would mirror those at No.102A. Furthermore, due to the existing height of the dwelling much of the roofscape is not visible from street level. It would therefore only be visible in the public realm in long range views of the property and, at this distance, would have a minimal impact on the character and appearance of the area. The addition of the side dormer would not match the attached neighbouring dwelling. However, due to its limited visibility, this would not diminish the symmetry of the two attached dwellings and would not harm their paired relationship and joint traditional appearance.
9. Consequently, the proposed development would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair of dwellings and surrounding area and would accord with Policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013). These policies require new development to use high quality architecture and design with a scale that reflects the character of the area whilst making a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of an area. The proposal would also be broadly consistent with the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning

Document (2017) which requires the design of dormers to be in keeping with the original dwelling.

Conditions

10. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have attached a condition requiring the development to accord with the approved plans, as this provides certainty. As the plans include details of the materials to be used, it is not necessary to impose a separate condition stating this as suggested by the Council.

Conclusions and Recommendation

11. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal is allowed.

Emma Worby

APPEALS PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Owen

INSPECTOR