

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: 12 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3245527

15 Medina Road, Islington, London N7 7JU

- 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 Ms Manjit Gill against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/3056/FUL, dated 11 October 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is the addition of a mansard roof and internal alterations to a top floor flat, and window/door replacements across the building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the addition of a mansard roof and internal alterations to a top floor flat, and window/door replacements across the building at 15 Medina Road, Islington, London N7 7JU in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2019/3056/FUL, dated 11 October 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: Site Location Plan 1:1250, 1929 21, 1929 22, 1929 23, 1929 24.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials set out within section 7 of the planning application form.

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.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is occupied by a mid-terrace dwelling in an urban area, which currently has four floors and is used as two separate flats. The surrounding terraced properties are generally uniform in appearance on both sides of the road which contributes positively to the character of the area and overall

- streetscene. The proposed roof extension would insert a mansard style roof to create a larger third floor, providing additional accommodation for the upper floor flat including an outdoor terrace to the front of the property.
5. Although it would be partially visible from some neighbouring dwellings, due to the height of the building and the height of the existing parapet wall along with set back position of the mansard roof from the front elevation, the proposed roof extension would have limited visibility from the public realm. This is demonstrated by other roof extensions in the area, on both sides of the street, which are similar to the proposed development and have limited visibility in the streetscene and therefore minimal impact upon the character and appearance of the area. The parapet wall on the front elevation would remain the same height as at present and therefore the front elevation would be largely unchanged from the streetscene.
 6. The Council has stated that the row of terraced dwellings, which the appeal property forms part of, is predominately unaltered. However, as mentioned within both the Council's report and the appellant's statement, both 2 and 16 Medina Road have extended mansard style roofs, along with a number of properties on the opposite side of the road. It has been stated that the extension at No.16 is smaller than the appeal proposal and may not benefit from planning permission, however its presence must still be taken into consideration and the proposal would not appear to be significantly taller. Therefore, although not necessarily a prevalent feature, this type of roof does form part of the character of the area and so the proposal would not be out of keeping with other dwellings.
 7. The proposal would be more visible from the rear of the property, due to the lower height of the parapet wall and the closer proximity of the extension to the rear elevation. However, it would be relatively modest in size and typical in design and would therefore not impact the visual appearance or traditional character of the host building. Overall, due to its minimal size and limited visibility from the public realm, the proposed roof extension would constitute a subservient addition to the main dwelling which would not significantly impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area.
 8. Therefore, the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling 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 collectively seek to ensure new development is of high quality, will reflect the character of the area and will be sympathetic in scale and appearance to the local identity. The proposal would also accord with the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) which states that roof extensions should be sympathetic to the host building.

Other Matters

9. A neighbour has raised concerns regarding the impact of the proposal upon their living conditions in respect of their privacy, noise and the security of their own roof terrace. With regard to privacy and security, it appears from the photos in the appellant's Design and Access Statement that there is a wall on the common boundary. Although this may not wholly prevent views between the respective amenity areas it provides some degree of privacy and in any case, it would be in both party's interests to respect each other's privacy. It

also, bearing in mind its proximity to the sheer two-storey face of the building, would seem to provide sufficient security. Again, it would be in both party's interests to respect each other's property. With regard to noise, it is considered that the terrace is of a sufficiently small size that it would be unlikely to accommodate activities which would result in significant noise or smells that would be disturbing to the neighbour, and certainly no more so than neighbouring gardens in traditional residential environments.

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. A condition requiring the use of materials which have been detailed in the planning application form is also necessary to ensure an appropriate appearance for the development.

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