



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 6 April 2021

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 April 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/20/3262501

61 Leconfield Road, LONDON, N5 2RZ

- 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 Olaf Cramme against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2020/1918/FUL, dated 17 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2020.
 - The development proposed is a Roof Extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for a Roof Extension at 61 Leconfield Road, LONDON, N5 2RZ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2020/1918/FUL, dated 17 July 2020, 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: Location Plan (Dwg No. 005), Floor Plans as Proposed (Dwg No. 100), Elevations and Sections as Proposed (Dwg No. 110) & Design and Access Statement (July 2020).
 - 3) That the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is an end terrace dwelling, set underneath a traditional London roof with a parapet to the front. The adjoining terrace has a different, taller roof form, and has been extended towards the appeal site. Other terraces in the street, visible in the context of the site, have varying roof forms, rooflines, heights, styles, designs and appearances.
4. The terrace containing the appeal site is itself somewhat mixed, with a variety of widths to the houses within it, and to the design and appearance of the parapet. As a result, whilst the area is characterised by terraced houses, there is little uniformity between the terraces.

5. The proposal would be of a design, scale, massing, height and appearance appropriate for, consistent with and typical of these sorts of extensions to these sorts of houses. As such, I do not consider that the proposal would be discordant or dominant. Furthermore, when viewed in the context of the wider street-scene, and particularly, coupled with the bend in the road, I do not consider that the proposal would be as prominent as suggested by the Council.
6. Viewed from the south, the proposal would be backdropped against the chimneys on the boundary, with taller roof forms in the foreground. Viewed from the north-west, the opposite would be the case, with the chimney limiting the visibility of the proposal and the taller roof beyond reducing the apparent height. To my mind, it is the location of this site, at the end of its terrace, which adds to its acceptability, as given its particular context, it has no real effect on the established rhythm and appearance of the terrace and area.
7. I accept that the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document January 2017 (the SPD) highlights the importance of the roofline in a street. However, in light of my conclusions on the roofline in the street above, I do not consider that this proposal, on this site, in this context, conflicts with the guidance in the SPD, or causes harm to the character or appearance of the area.
8. I note the examples cited by the Council and was able to see them in the course of my site visit, as well as other roof extensions in Leconfield Road itself. I do not have the details of the appeals cited by the Council, but it is clear from my visit that the appeal site is materially different from those sites.
9. In addition, I consider that owing to the particular character of the immediate context of the site, notably the scale of other buildings around it, the appeal site itself has a distinct character and appearance both to the examples given and to the rest of the terrace in which it is found. The curve in the road, as well as the step up to the adjacent buildings all combine to set the appeal site apart from the rest of its terrace, and reduce the apparent scale of the proposal in comparison to the rest of the terrace, and indeed, the wider street-scene.
10. I therefore consider that the proposal would accord with Policy CS8 of Islington's Core Strategy and Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is high quality, and is appropriate to and reflects the character of the area. The proposal would also accord with guidance in the SPD around the site-specific application of urban design principles, including alterations to rooflines.

Conditions

11. Having had regard to the submissions of the Council, the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance I have imposed standard conditions concerning commencement (1), compliance with the submitted plans (2), and requiring the use of matching materials, in order to ensure the satisfactory appearance of the completed development. The conditions meet the tests in, and requirements of both the Framework and the Planning Practice Guidance.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal accords with the development plan and there are no material considerations which indicate a decision be taken other than in accordance with it. It should therefore be allowed, and planning permission granted.

S Dean

INSPECTOR