



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 19 October 2021

by Graham Wraight BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/21/3277524

Flat C, 91 Petherton Road, Islington, London N5 2QT

- 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 Mark Masson against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/0577/FUL, dated 25 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 22 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a front dormer roof extension comprising 3 x bays of double glazed timber sash windows with dormer roof and dormer cheek walls clad in zinc (Dormer as approved and built at no.88 and 100 Petherton Road).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property sits in a terrace comprising of numbers 79 to 107 Petherton Road, with its roof being clearly visible in the street scene due to the width of the road and the presence of a central public walkway. This terrace is physically separated from another terrace of properties of the same design that commences at 109 Petherton Road.
4. On the opposite side of the road there are other period properties, again including terraced properties that reflect the same overall design as the appeal property. Whereas the roof planes of the terrace in which the appeal property sits are unbroken by the presence of front dormer windows, elsewhere a great number of front dormer windows are noted on properties along Petherton Road.
5. Whilst front dormer windows are therefore common features within the surrounding area and are contributors to its overall character and appearance, they are clustered together and prevalent in number on the individual terraces on which they are located. In contrast, the addition of the proposed dormer to the front roof plane of the appeal property would be unique within the roofscape of the terrace in which the appeal property sits.
6. By reason of it being the only front dormer in this context and due to the prominence it would have in the street scene, it would form a visually dominant and discordant feature. Furthermore, it would substantially disrupt the rhythm

and uniformity of the roofscape, which in turn defines the character and appearance of this particular terrace and the positive contribution it makes to the surrounding area. It is acknowledged that the proposal has been designed to be an inset into the roof and to utilise matching materials, however notwithstanding this it would still be large in size and, in any event, its design would not overcome the harm caused by its presence in the circumstances that have been outlined.

7. It is apparent that the Council has granted planning permission for new front dormers on other terraces in the vicinity, but these relate to the terraces that already have numerous dormer windows present. Allowing new or replacement dormers in this context is not comparable to the situation that arises in the case of the appeal proposal. Furthermore, it has not been suggested that any planning permissions have been granted for front dormers on the terrace in which the appeal property is located. The presence of the other dormers and the permissions that have been granted for them does not therefore justify the appeal proposal.
8. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed development would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area. Consequently, it would fail to accord with Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021, Policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2013, where they seek to protect character and appearance. There would also be a conflict with the Islington Urban Design Guide 2017 and The National Planning Policy Framework in the same respect.

Other Matters

9. Although the appeal property is not listed, in a conservation area or subject to article 4 directions, this does not justify a harmful development. The proposal would allow for additional floorspace to be provided at the property, however the overall benefits of this would be limited due to the scale of what is proposed, and this too does not outweigh the harm to character and appearance that would arise.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Graham Wraight

INSPECTOR