



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2023

by F Harrison BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23rd August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/23/3319197

19 Almington Street, Islington, London N4 3BG

- 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 Simon Jansen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2022/4062/FUL, dated 25 November 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 January 2023.
 - The development proposed is hip to gable, L shaped dormer, floor plan redesign and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I note that, subject to modifications, the Islington Local Plan has recently been found sound. It has not yet however been adopted and does not form part of the development plan. Nevertheless, it is a material consideration in this case and given the advanced stage it has now reached, it carries significant weight. The Council has referred me to two emerging policies and the appellant has had the opportunity to comment upon the latest position of the Local Plan but has not responded.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the appeal property.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is a previously extended two-storey end of terrace. There are a range of extensions to the rear of the terraces and some differences in appearance, however there is uniformity in the roofscape in the section of terraces nearest to the appeal site owing to the absence of roof extensions. This creates a clear sense of balance which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area.
5. The proposed change in roof design from hip to gable is not in dispute. However, while there is some set up from the eaves, the proposed dormer would be the full width of the appeal property and would not be set down from the ridgeline or set in from the sides. The resultant large scale of the proposed dormer would dominate the roof. Moreover, in combination with the extension on top of the existing outrigger, the proposed development would be overly prominent and a bulky addition to the appeal property.

6. The Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) advises that rooflines are an important factor contributing to the rhythm and uniformity of a residential terrace and successful proposals will be both sympathetic to the host building and harmonise with the roofline in the vicinity. The scale and form of the proposal would be conspicuous, detracting from the generally harmonious roofscape. Owing to the height of the proposed extension above the outrigger extending above the eaves, overall, the development would not relate positively to the appeal property or the prevailing character and appearance of the area.
7. Despite the use of matching materials, the proposed development would appear incongruous in views from Almington Street and from within neighbouring properties and private gardens. Even if the full extent of the proposal would not be seen in public views from Almington Street, the bulky, discordant addition to the roofscape and the detrimental effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area would still be readily apparent. While I note that the appeal site is not subject to heritage constraints, the proposal would nevertheless draw the eye and be a visually intrusive feature.
8. There are other examples of existing roof extensions and L shaped dormers, of which there are several, and therefore a feature of the wider area. However, the context of the examples and the relationship with the street scene differs. None of the examples are located at the end of a terrace, nor are they in a section of the street where there is uniformity in the roofscape. As such, they are not directly comparable. The other examples do not, therefore, lead me away from my above findings.
9. Consequently, for the reasons given, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area. This is in conflict with policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan (2021), Policy CS8 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011), Policy DM2.1 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013) and policies PLAN1 and DH1 from the emerging Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies (September 2019). These policies, amongst other things, require development to deliver good design, reflect the character of the area and respond positively to existing buildings.
10. The proposal is also contrary to the guidance regarding roof extensions set out in the SPD, and contrary to the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) in relation to achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

11. 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, I conclude that the appeal is dismissed.

F Harrison

INSPECTOR