



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 October 2022

**by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 01 December 2022**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/22/3298070**

**54 Loraine Road, Islington, London N7 6HB**

- 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 Don Kaufman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
  - The application Ref P2021/3673/FUL, dated 15 December 2021, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2022.
  - The development proposed is widening of front and rear dormers.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## 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 a four-storey end of terrace dwelling. At the front there is variety in appearance within the street as a whole. However, in the area immediate to the appeal site, despite some differences in appearance, the terraces are in general harmony with each other. There is an existing small front dormer at the appeal site, set in at both sides. However, there is otherwise an absence of dormers in this section of the street and a consistency in the roofscape, which creates a sense of balance. The symmetry of this roofscape is a key feature and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
4. The creation of a larger dormer than currently exists at the front of the appeal property would be an incongruous addition, detracting from the general consistency of the existing roofscape.
5. I understand that this proposal has been amended from a previous scheme which was refused permission in relation to a full width front dormer. However, while the proposed dormer will remain set in from the neighbouring terrace, as the existing dormer is, it would be extended to the edge of the opposite gable end. This would create an unbalancing effect for both the appeal property and this section of the row of terraces. I note that the two-storey property on the other side of the appeal property, owing to the difference in heights, does not form part of the same roofline.

6. I have considered the other examples of existing front dormer roof extensions, of which there are several, and therefore a feature of the wider area. However, they are notably absent from the terraces immediately around the appeal site. The examples provided are in a different section of the street and are not directly comparable, having different contexts to the proposal before me.
7. At the rear of the appeal site there are a number of dormer windows of different sizes and appearance. However, these existing dormers, including at the appeal property, are set in from the eaves and are not full width, as the proposal would be. The proposal would therefore result in a bulky addition, taking up the entire roofspace. Despite the end of terrace location, it would dominate the existing property and appear cramped in comparison to the character and appearance of the terraces in the immediate area.
8. From my site visit I saw there were no clear public views of the rear of the property from Lowman Road as the appeal site is well screened by a large established tree. There would however be views of the proposal from within neighbouring properties and the private gardens. The detrimental effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area would be experienced from these views. Moreover, a lack of public views is not a reason in itself to allow the appeal scheme.
9. The side elevation of the appeal property is visible from Holloway Road, being taller than the two-storey corner building that fronts Loraine Road and Holloway Road. Looking directly opposite the appeal site, it can be seen from the furthest side of Holloway Road and there are longer views along this side of Holloway Road, walking towards the junction with Loraine Road. The proposal would bring development up to the edge of the gable end on this side elevation, resulting in a bulkier addition to the roofscape than currently exists. While I note that the dormers would be set back from the front and rear elevations, the proposal would draw the eye when viewed from the side and would be an incongruous addition.
10. Islington's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (2017) advises that the position of dormers and the arrangement of windows should take account of the composition of the windows immediately below them on the elevation. The dormer should be positioned a clear distance below the ridge-line, significantly clear of the boundary parapets, and above the line of the eaves. The proposed front and rear dormers in the appeal scheme are contrary to the guidance contained in the SPD. As such, the location of both the dormers do not relate positively to the appeal property. Moreover, the arrangement of windows on the rear dormer do not reinforce the rhythm and uniformity of the third floor of the terraces in the area immediate to the site.
11. Consequently, for the reasons given, the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is in conflict with Policy CS8 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011) and Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013). These policies seek development that reflects the character of the area and is of a high quality of design, making a positive contribution to the local character and responding positively to existing buildings.
12. The proposal is also contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) in relation to achieving well designed places, set out in Section 12.

## **Other Matters**

13. I note that the appeal site is in an accessible location, and it is said that the proposal would constitute a form of sustainable development, which is a clear benefit. While reference is made to the benefit the proposed large glass windows with Juliette balcony offers to the scheme, the precise extent of benefit has not been clearly articulated and therefore, I give it only limited weight. The appellant also states that the proposal would provide an improved living space for present and future occupiers. However, this benefit is largely private and has not influenced my decision. There is also said to be no detrimental effect on the amenity of neighbours arising from the proposal, the lack of harm on this matter however would only be a neutral factor.

## **Conclusion**

14. My above findings bring the proposal into conflict with the development plan, read as a whole. There are no material considerations that have been shown to have sufficient weight to warrant a decision otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

*F Harrison*

INSPECTOR