
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2022 by S Witherley CIHCM MRTPI

Decision by H Nicholls FdA MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 May 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/22/3292667

70 Elwood Street, Islington, London N5 1EH

- 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 Filis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/3112/FUL, dated 18 October 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 December 2021.
 - The development proposed is second floor roof extension over outrigger and alterations to existing dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

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

Main Issue

3. The effect on the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Reasons

4. No. 70 is an end of terrace property located on a corner plot. The front of the property overlooks Elwood Street with its side/rear elevations respectively overlooking Avenell Road and the blank flank wall of No. 51 Avenell Road.
5. Whilst I noted a number of surrounding properties, including the appeal site, have been modified at roof level, there remains consistency in the regular rhythm of pitched roofs and subordinate paired rear off shoots which make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.
6. The proposal seeks to create a flat roof extension over half of the existing two-storey rear off shoot and re-clad the existing dormer window in zinc material. Notwithstanding that the materials proposed would be considered acceptable, as a result of its scale, including that of its proposed depth, massing, and overall bulky appearance, the proposal would significantly alter the appearance and proportions of the existing rear off shoot. As such, it would appear as a dominant and juxtaposed addition, which given its prominent and highly visible corner location, would be harmful to the character and appearance of both No. 70 and the surrounding area.

7. Whilst I appreciate that the existing off shoot is not original and has been modified with a flat roof, there remains a degree of uniformity between its paired addition in term of overall scale and its subordinate relationship to the main property. The proposal as a result of its bulky and top-heavy appearance would disrupt this. It would not, therefore, comply with the guidance contained in the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) which seeks roof extensions and alterations to be designed to be both sympathetic to the host building and harmonise with the predominant roofline in the vicinity.
8. The appellant has provided details including a site plan which identifies properties within the locality that benefit from roof extensions. Little information is before me as to when or if planning permission was granted for these or the policies that applied at the time of their consideration. Nevertheless, the developments that I did observe elsewhere, particularly those on end of terrace rows and similar corner plots as the appeal site, appeared subordinate in scale and respected the original form and character of the host building. For the reasons discussed above, the proposed development would appear bulky and out of keeping. Overall, I was unable to draw any direct parallels from those other developments with the proposal before me.
9. Both parties have referenced a previous appeal¹ at No. 70 which sought a second-floor outrigger roof extension and zinc re-cladding of existing dormer, which was dismissed by the Inspector. The appellant states the concerns raised by that Inspector have now been addressed as the proposal has a reduced depth of 1 metre. Whilst it is clear the appellant has made attempts to address the concerns raised, the proposal, despite its reduced depth, would appear as a visually dominant and juxtaposed addition for the reasons discussed above.
10. The appellant notes as a fall-back position a lawful certificate application² was approved by the Council. This approved scheme sought *the formation of rear dormer over back addition*. Having viewed the details provided, the approved scheme appears reduced in scale to the one proposed under this appeal. It is the overall scale and bulky appearance of the current proposal that results in harm to the appeal property. As the cited fallback position would not replicate development of the same dimensions as the proposal before me, limited weight is attached to this argument.
11. Having regard to all matters raised, it is concluded that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area. Consequently, it would be contrary to Policy CS8 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011), Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013) and Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021) which collectively seek development to reflect the character of the area, be of high quality, and make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the most relevant policies in an up-to-date development plan and there are no material considerations that indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with therewith.

¹ APP/V5570/D/21/3277809

² P2019/2569/COLP

13. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed

S Witherley

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

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

H Nicholls

INSPECTOR