



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2024

**by D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 10<sup>th</sup> July 2024**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/23/3333386**

**Flat C 38 Ashley Road, Islington, London N19 3AF**

- 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 Sam Alberman against the decision of the London Borough of Islington Council.
  - The application Ref is P2023/1509/FUL.
  - The development proposed is described as the construction of a rear roof dormer and hip to gable extension, with 3No roof-lights to the front roof slope to accommodate a new bedroom and the creation of a rear roof terrace above the existing outrigger.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. Since the decision was made by the Council, the Council adopted the Strategic and Development Management Policies (SDMP) on 29 September 2023. The SDMP supersedes the policies of the Islington Core Strategy 2011 and Islington Development Management Policies 2013 which are cited in the Council's decision notice. I have therefore determined the appeal with the newly adopted policies in mind.
3. In addition, since the decision was made by the Council, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published (19 December 2023). This does not materially change the planning policy context in respect of the main issue.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

### Reasons

5. No.38 Ashley Road is a large three storey semi-detached building, with a lower ground floor positioned partially below street level. The roof is hipped and includes a large chimney stack, positioned centrally with No.36 Ashley Road (No.36), which is its semi-detached pairing. No.36 and No.38 are visually symmetrical resulting in a well-balanced front façade. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character and includes some variety in dwelling type and design, including some buildings with gable roofs. Notwithstanding

this variety, the design of Nos.36 and 38, is one of the predominant designs within the street. The visual symmetry of the semi-detached buildings along Ashley Road is a positive characteristic of the street.

6. The proposed hip-to-gable extension would change the original roof form of the property and results in a design which is not characteristic to the dwelling or surrounding semi-detached properties. The extension would add greater vertical emphasis to the property and would disrupt the visual rhythm of the roofscape within the street. Therefore, the extension would appear visually out of context and unsympathetic to its surroundings. In addition, the extension would result in No.38 appearing bulkier than No.36 resulting in a visual imbalance to the pairing.
7. The proposed rear dormer is large and would occupy the width of the extended roof almost entirely. As such the dormer would be positioned very close to the proposed side gable. The rear siting would ensure that the full extent of its scale would not be prominent from Ashley Road. However, its positioning, close to the side gable would add further additional bulk to this elevation which could be visible from the street between the dwelling and its detached neighbour. While this view may be glimpsed, the additional scale and mass would, nonetheless, further exacerbate the harmful effect of the hip-to-gable extension.
8. My attention has been drawn to a similar development on Ashley Road, and Shaftesbury Road. No.9 Ashley Road (No.9) has been extended with a hip to gable roof extension, while its pairing No.11 Ashley Road retains a hipped roof. No.9 is located adjacent to the rear elevation of dwellings on Highcroft Road which provides a different visual relationship and built context. That site is also afforded a greater degree of screening by street landscaping. Nonetheless, the appeal proposals would increase the proportion of imbalanced semi-detached properties within Ashley Road, eroding further a positive visual characteristic of the street. Therefore, I do not consider the development at No.9 sets a precedent for a development which I have found to be harmful.
9. Shaftesbury Road runs parallel to Ashley Road, and appears to have a higher proportion of hip to gable extensions. It is therefore a roof form which appears to be more established on that street. Nonetheless, Shaftesbury Road does not form the visual context of the appeal site and, in any event, I have assessed the proposals on its individual merits.
10. For the above reasons, the development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area. Therefore, the proposals would be contrary to Policies D1 and D4 of the London Plan 2021; policy PLAN1 of the SDMP; and the Framework. Together, amongst other things, these seek to achieve development which is of high-quality design which respects local context. The development would also fail to adhere to the guidance set out in Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) which requires roof extensions to be designed in a style appropriate to the host building.

**Conclusion**

11. For the above reasons the appeal is dismissed.

*D Cleary*

INSPECTOR