

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

DECISION DATE	REF.	SITE	DEVELOPMENT	NOTES
16/04/2013	P2012/0034/FUL	111 Balfour Road	Second floor extension above existing rear outrigger in materials, style and design to match existing.	<p>Similar proposals have recently been approved under Permitted Development However, if they had come in as full planning application, they're likely to have been refused as in this instance.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector took the view that the proposal was acceptable as it is not visible from the public realm.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? The Council will continue to assess proposals on individual merit.</p>
17/04/13	P2012/0233	12 Wolsey Road	Roof extension	<p>The terrace is largely unaltered and only four out of 21 properties have roof extensions. The proposed extension although set back would be highly visible from long views along Queen Margaret Grove. Similar extensions along the terrace were also considered unacceptable.</p> <p>All extensions predate the NPPF; London Plan; Core Strategy; DM Policies and the Islington Urban Design Guide and only one was allowed after the adoption of the UDP.</p> <p>Therefore this had to be tested at appeal.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector stated that the rear would be only be visible from the enclosed gardens of adjoining properties and the extension would be seen from Queen Margaret's Grove in the context of the other roof extensions in the terrace. The Inspector was of the view that the proposal would not lead to a cumulative harmful impact of the wider streetscene.</p> <p>The inspector notes that the roof extension at no. 15 was approved following the adoption of the existing UDP and it is not a case where the terrace has a single roof extension that</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				<p>pre-dates the adoption of the UDP and stated that in reference to policy DM3 of the DMP 'based on the information before me I have no reason to consider the building is a designated or non-designated heritage asset and I therefore give the matter very limited weight'.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? The current review of the IUDG will look at the approach to dormers.</p>
10/04/2013	P120449	31 Fairbridge Road	Conversion of house into three flats, extension of existing ground floor, new roof windows on front elevation, new rear dormer and convert hipped roof to gable.	<p>Main issue; appearance/design</p> <p>Inspector took into account a similar extension at 27. He disagreed with the ground floor extension not being subservient and perceived the upper floors as more important in terms of fenestration patterns etc.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? We need to accept what is actually built in the vicinity, even if it does not have permission or was built prior to existing policy.</p>
16/04/2013	P122437	149 Bunning Way	Single storey rear extension with sliding doors and two rooflights to pitched tiled roof	<p>Lesson to be learned? Over prescriptive use of BRE guidance when there should be some flexibility in decisions. Need to be sure there is demonstrable harm to amenity when refusing.</p>
1/05/2013	P120981	52 Wedmore Street (The Good Intent PH)	Demolition of the existing public house and the erection of six, three storey town houses.	<p>Development had significant local objection. Several revisions secured to address design concerns. Key point of objection concerned the loss of public house with Policy colleagues seeking to secure valued community facilities. The pub was not vacant but applicants supplied extensive financial evidence to try and demonstrate the poor profitability and long term poor viability levels of the pub to try and overcome the lack of marketing and comply with DM policy 4.10. Single main issue regarding the value of the pub to the</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				<p>local community and whether its loss had been fully justified. Other reasons for refusal were addressed by the applicants and withdrawn by the council at the hearing.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Difficult case overall. Good modern and interesting design of the overall scheme. It was and continues to be difficult to define exactly what constitutes a valued community facility and a well-used pub. There is a dichotomy between what locals may feel is a valued community facility and the economic reality of an existing pub which has a very low turnover and profit levels. By the letter of the adopted policy the application should have been refused. In respect the Inspector's decision was extremely generous in interpreting the pub protection policy hence why the council judicially reviewed the decision - albeit unsuccessfully.</p>
3/05/2013	P120929	245 Caledonian Road	Change of use of rear of existing accountant's office to a two bedroom self-contained flat located on ground and basement floors	<p>Non-determination appeal (advised Inspectorate we would have approved). Inspector held existing employment space is under used and retention of an element of employment use is sufficient to satisfy Council's policy. Also held that (although part basement and not dual-aspect), unit would provide "pleasant and spacious accommodation".</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? May need policy update on what is an acceptable % loss of retail. Accommodation including basement may be acceptable where a maisonette.</p>
17/05/2013	P2012/0452/FUL	6a Grange Road	Proposed improvements and extensions	<p>The Inspector concluded that the alterations would alter the appearance of the rear elevation but not cause harm as it is no architectural merit. As such the proposals were acceptable</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? The Council will continue to assess</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				proposals on individual merit and in this instance the contemporary design and appearance is thought not preserve or enhance the conservation area.
9/05/2013	P120341	9-11 Coleridge Road	Rear lower ground floor and first floor extensions to studio units and a mansard roof extension.	<p>We agreed extensions were fine, but had issue with the mansard. Inspector ruled that the existing roof alterations in the vicinity formed the character and appearance of the roofscape as Council had not indicated any proposal to seek their removal.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? We need to research the lawfulness of surrounding extensions and make it very clear in our report so they can't be relied upon as a precedent.</p>
16/05/2013	P112840	60 Copenhagen Street, Lark in the Park	Demolition of an existing public house and replacement with 5 terrace houses.	Committee overturn. Focussed on loss of public house and community facility. Vacant for over 4 yrs and good test of DM 27. Inspector did not consider it a valuable community facility and considered long term vacancy and submitted accounts during appeal process to address policy requirements of Emerging DM policy 27. Long term vacancy is a key consideration even in absence of marketing evidence.
8/05/2013	P112271	498 Holloway Road	Conversion of upper parts to provide 2 No one-bedroom apartments.	<p>Appeal based on non determination although part of the delay lay with the applicant in supplying amended plans.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? The amended scheme was slightly below the space standards though in other respects were satisfactory. Need to see overall merit of scheme and make balanced judgement.</p>
17/05/2013	P120496	F4, 12a Stonefield Street	Internal alterations and refurbishment of windows	The application appealed against involved moving a partition in its historical location and inserting double doors. Inspector allowed the appeal to be varied whilst under submission to retain the partition wall in situ but to widen the opening to

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				<p>install the double doors. The Council maintained this was still harmful but the Inspector found otherwise. The Inspector did agree that moving the partition would be harmful.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? The Council should have objected to the variation being accepted as the proposal was different to the original refusal.</p>
28/05/2013	P121121	30 Myddleton Square	Replacement windows in a Listed Building	<p>Historic casement windows were removed after Design and Conservation Team leader advised that they should be retained. Inappropriate sash windows (the openings were originally designed for casement windows) with horns fitted. Enforcement case was opened. Inspector concluded that the windows were post-war despite our evidence that they were Edwardian and therefore did not think that the historic windows were significant. Inspector did not think that the new windows caused harm.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? We disagree with the Inspector's assessment and decision</p>
29/05/2013	P120070	6 Westbourne Road	Removal of existing aluminium shop front, conversion of existing ground floor post office into studio flat and replacement of the shop front with a new rendered wall and window.	<p>Refused on loss of local shop (former post office) in local shopping centre and poor internal accommodation for the studio flat. The Inspector considered the loss of the shop in the context of others lost in the parade and the proximity of principal shopping streets, a ten minute walk away.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Need to be more pragmatic (less exacting standards) regarding the amenity of the residential unit.</p>
18/06/2013	P121542	30 Brecknock Road	Erection of a mansard roof, single storey rear extension in association with the COU part	<p>Appeal on non-determination downgraded from Public Inquiry to Written Representations on the basis that Council would offer no evidence beyond that to support conditions. In</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

			<p>retail unit and single residential unit to create 3 self contained units plus alterations to the front and rear elevations.</p>	<p>absence of evidence to prove otherwise, Inspector considered that loss of 11sqm potential retail/ancillary storage at rear would not result in unit being too small to be viable and would therefore not detract from viability and vitality of shopping frontage. Inspector agreed with LPA and suggested a condition requiring reconfiguration of under sized one-bed flat to become a studio and therefore meet minimum space standards.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Could try recommending condition for reconfiguration of undersized one-bed units to become studios elsewhere though note that studios not encouraged by policy and question over whether such a condition would comply with tests.</p>
26/06/2013	P122339	31 Junction Road	<p>Change of use of ground floor A1 to A2 letting agency without complying with a condition attached to planning permission Ref. P121098</p>	<p>Inspector noted that policy did not say how many betting shops would be too many and that Licencing would control antisocial behaviour.</p> <p>He noted that objections on moral/social grounds were irrelevant.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Need to have access to evidence regarding betting and its effects on shopping parade vitality. Policy to consider this.</p>
21/06/2013	P122070	The Noble, 29 Crouch Hill, London, N4	<p>Conversion of A4 into A1 at ground floor with two 1-bed and one 2-bed self-contained flats above plus external alterations including first floor rear extension and rear roof terraces</p>	<p>The first floor level accommodation was refused based on 41and 42sqm gross internal area. These were considered as a 1 bed / 2 person dwelling in the assessment based on design of the property.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? If a bedroom is less than 12sqm we should consider this as a 1bed /1person flat. However, still strive to achieve adopted space standards regardless of this</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				decision.
15/07/2013	P2013/0827/FUL	6 Canon Street	Mansard roof extension to end of terrace single family dwelling.	Lesson to be learned? Case by case basis and importance of rear unaltered rooflines.
26/07/2013	P2012/0542/FUL	74 Tollington Way	Roof extension to provide additional residential accommodation	<p>The proposed full width brick roof extension was considered to be of inappropriate size, design and materials and therefore harmful to the character and appearance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The planning Inspector was of the view that the property at no. 76 with a full width flat roof extension, similar to that proposed had already undermined the integrity and unity of the terrace of three houses.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Very short terrace difficult to argue impact on the integrity and unity as it is already compromised.</p>
07/08/2013	P2013/0380/FUL	3 Cheverton Road	Two rooflights to the front roofslope	<p>The two rooflights proposed to the front roofslope were considered to be harmful to the architectural character of the building and were contrary to the Conservation Area Design Guidelines which stipulated that rooflights which are visible from the street will not be permitted.</p> <p>Whilst not highly visible from the Cherverton Road the Inspector identifies oblique view of the lower part which form part of the terrace when viewed from the junction of Cheverton Road and Hazelville Road.</p> <p>The Inspector also identifies that the properties front roofslope from Pilgrims Way close to its junction with Hazelvill Road. However, considers this view to be distance and substantially framed and dominated by the massing of</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				<p>closer buildings. The Inspector therefore considered the not to appear unduly prominent, incongruous or alien addition to the roofscape and not to adversely disrupt the rhythm of the terrace's roofline particularly where the remainder of the dwellings are not clearly visible.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? We disagree with the Inspector's decision.</p>
31/07/2013	P121957	5 Rickthorne Road	Refurbishment of a 3-bedroom Victorian terrace house into two self-contained flats: one 3-bedroom flat and one, 1-bedroom flat	<p>The issue was over the size and quality of the basement flat in regard to planning standards-light, aspect, room size.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? We disagree with the Inspectors decision in regard to room size and what constitutes good amenity standards.</p>
12/08/2013	P121752	71 Mildmay Park,	Demolish ground floor back addition, add front mansard with two dormers, add part lower ground/part ground floor levels extensions, provide glass parapets to lower ground floor existing/extensions, and internal changes.	<p>Retrospective application for a mansard which was consider harmful in the assessment and refused. Rear dormer was PD however the council were assessing the mansard as a whole. Previous Inspectors decision for mansard concluded that the dormer to the rear was 'bulky' etc but did not mention the front</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? As the Inspector had not mentioned the front aspect of the dormer they therefore did not take issue with this aspect of the design and therefore overall the application should have not warranted refusal. The first Inspector report was not clear and gave evidence of bad design within the proposal.</p>
08/08/2013	P121651	297 Hornsey Road	Change of use of ground floor office to flat	<p>Refused only on loss of shopfront (locally listed). During appeal, appellant submitted revised drawing showing shopfront retained.</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				Lesson to be learned? Should have applied for costs.
08/08/2013	P121633	1 Hanover Yard	Retrospective application for two 45° rooflights built 800mm higher than balustrade height instead of 3 30° rooflights to balustrade height, and for minor changes to number of voltaics on the roof and the replacing of single glazed non-original plate glass opening with double glazed unit, previously permitted in application no P102631	Retrospective application for rooflights that were enlarged from the previous approval. Were considered too big and refused. Lesson to be learned? Not visible from public views and would not cause harm to the character of the building or the Conservation Area.
30/08/2013	P112141	2 Sans Walk	Removal of condition 3 (means of ventilation AOD)	This case had special circumstances to justify the condition which was appealed. It was one of the recent cases with the Inspector putting the responsibility on the local authority to submit evidence to demonstrate the harm, rather than the appellant to demonstrate that there was no harm. Lesson to be learned? This case was very site specific - we knew it was a risk, but thought it was worth a try.
29/08/2013	P2013/0410/FUL	63 Kelvin Road	Construction of a new loft conversion with external terrace to the rear elevation, new roof lights to front and rear roof pitches, new flat roof in lead to rear roof pitch, glazed aluminium doors to rear terrace and steel balustrade to terrace.	Inspector found that as other large dormers existed in the terrace, that the proposal was no worse in context. Lesson to be learned? Householder appeal and history of existing dormers on neighbouring properties not considered in report. However, Inspectors are overruling pre-policy ones and determining on what exists.

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

16/08/2013	P121951	32 Myddleton Square	<p>A. Removal of under-garden cellar and replacement with steps from basement up to garden.</p> <p>B. Removal of under-garden cellar and replacement with steps from basement up to garden.</p>	<p>We accepted the cellar was not original but wished to preserve it on account of it being unusual. Inspector sided with Appellant that 'unusual' is not a reason for retention unless directly related to the heritage value of the property. Inspector also advised the development would allow greater light into the property and improve amenity.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? A fair decision and accept it could have gone either way.</p>
10/09/2013	E12/06354	1 Whitehall Park	Erection of wooden fencing to the front, side and rear garden area of the property.	<p>Inspector did not agree that there was material harm caused by the boundary additions, and a condition requiring further planting would make the development acceptable.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? This is a very poor decision, and we would take the same action again in the future for similar breaches.</p>
19/09/2013	P120464	2b York Way	Change of use from café (A3 use class) to hot food takeaway (A5 use class) and installation of new shopfront along with extension and improvement to the extract ducting to rear and removal of roller shutters	<p>Officer recommendation over turned by committee members.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Recommendation over turned by committee members.</p>
25/09/2013	P112954	12 Brecknock Road	Refurbishment and extensions	<p>Dwelling mix in Minors constrained by unit scale.</p> <p>Outlook of 2 metres to 1.4 metre raised garden, and then 5.5 metre high fence considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Refused this due to impact on neighbours – not a view shared by the Inspector.</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

02/09/2013	P122271	29 Highbury New Park	Change of use of a building to create five self-contained residential units, erection of a single storey rear extension, external alterations including replacement of the windows and front boundary treatment without complying with two conditions attached to planning permission RefP120112	Inspector found the condition was unreasonable as the parking space existed legally and there was a policy vacuum insofar as removing existing parking is concerned. Lesson to be learned? A bit harsh, but need to be careful of new policy – it isn't always the same as the old!
11/09/2013	P2013/1220/FUL	76 Dresden Road	Ground floor single-storey rear extensions to existing terrace house with associated internal and garden reconfigurations.	Inspector did not feel there was demonstrable harm to the neighbouring property given the extension would only be marginally higher than existing fence. Lesson to be learned? We accept this could have gone either way but we felt there would be demonstrable harm to adjoining property, so refused it. Inspector critical of our unsubstantiated light concerns, so need to comprehensively address this in future.
09/09/2013	P120782	88C Fonthill Road	Proposed second floor & mansard roof extension	We refused as the neighbour had agreed to amend. However, the surrounds were already overdeveloped in a similar way to the appeal proposal. Lesson to be learned? We had to refuse, but it is not a surprise that the appeal was allowed given the surrounding developments and what appears to be a relaxed interpretation of roof extension policy adopted by the Inspectorate.
17/09/2013	P2013/1156/FUL	113 Calabria Road	Rear dormer loft conversion	Dormer refused as it was not consistent with the Conservation Area Design Guide (not being set back on

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				<p>average by 1m from each party wall by virtue of its off-centre position). The Inspector saw fit to give a mathematical definition of 'average', and therefore felt the dormer was in compliance.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? An odd interpretation of policy that will not change our position in future.</p>
23/09/2013	P121259	114 Highbury New Park	New dormer with window in rear roof	<p>Inspector acknowledged roofline policy (neighbouring dormers all pre-2006) but justified the dormer on design and being comparable to neighbouring dormers</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Inspectors are inconsistent in their decisions regarding roof extensions.</p>
01/10/2013	P2012/0425/FUL	Flat C, 44 Kingsdown Road	Loft conversion incorporating a rear dormer, two rooflights at the front and associated works.	<p>Inspector noted rear dormer structures of different shapes and sizes on neighbouring terraces, seen to a greater or lesser extent from street level. Dormer would nestle unobtrusively between the two chimneys.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Note presence of other structures in the terrace (i.e. two substantial chimneys on party walls) and consider adjoining terraces in such circumstances</p>
10/10/2013	P122003	300 Caledonian Road	Conversion of existing rear part of vacant commercial basement to provide new studio flat and excavation of part of rear garden to create new patio.	<p>The unit met the minimum size for a studio flat but is east facing single aspect at basement level. The living space would only be lit by a single basement level window flanked by high rear extensions that significantly restrict light levels and outlook. The inspector did not agree that the living conditions would be sub-standard.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Inspectors may be under pressure to approve developments providing new residential units? The standard of residential accommodation is still considered to be unacceptable therefore the application would still be</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				refused again.
01/10/2013	P2013/0850/FUL	41 Offord Road	Alterations to existing roof to incorporate a mansard style roof extension with open terrace area to the front and installation of an external staircase to the front lightwell.	<p>The roof extension would be visible from long views to the rear and the decision will make it very difficult to refuse any other roof extension in this long terrace in the conservation area.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? We disagree with the Inspector's assessment and decision but will be hard to refuse similar now.</p>
24/10/2013 RB	P121789	4 Fairbridge Road,	Rear extension at ground floor level to existing HMO to form 2 self - contained flats.	<p>We were happy with the change of use in principle, not the extension. Inspector found that the design of the extension would not be out of place with matching materials and would maintain the character of the area. While some impact on the neighbours it was not enough to warrant refusal.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? It is a fair decision, and probably what we expected given the more relaxed approach the Inspectorate appear to be taking regarding the quality of accommodation.</p>
29/10/2013	P2012/0505/ADV	26-27 Cowcross Street	1 set of externally illuminated applied lettering, 1 set of non-illuminated applied lettering, 1 internally illuminated projecting sign, 2 internally illuminated menu boxes and 3 sets of white applied vinyl glazing	<p>Part Refused Part allowed. Discussions around the acceptability of the allowed fascia sign. Conservation maintain their view on the unacceptability of the fascia signs and made reference to Bryon's smaller signage.</p> <p>Please refer to Listed Building Consent appeal decision which is in contradiction to this one.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Inspector's views should be taken into account for similar decisions – on internally illuminated signs.</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

06/12/2013 TB	P2013/1543/FUL	58 St Georges Avenue	New metal railings to an existing second floor roof terrace.	<p>Inspector noted nearby properties have roof terraces, at first floor level, perception of being overlooked would not greatly increase as a result of the development in this particular location because of the layout of the properties. no. 56's rear windows would not be directly visible from the extended roof terrace, because the existing chimney stack obstructs views</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Perhaps a harsh amendment to the original scheme requiring a reduction in the depth of the roof terrace. Site specific circumstances of habitable rooms are the key to each case.</p>
08/11/2013	P122134	13 Balfour Road	Loft conversion and construction of rear dormer.	<p>Lesson to be learned? The Inspector gave a lot of weight to an adjoining neighbour's certificate for a rear dormer which was not built yet and less visible from the private realm. Was a fair refusal based on policy on roof extensions.</p>
11/12/2013	P121784	17 College Cross	Enlargement of door opening on lower ground floor on rear elevation.	<p>We disagree with the inspector's decision. Although the rear ground floor is not visible from the street, the works are harmful to the setting of the listed building.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Similar trend with recent decisions where appeals are allowed on the basis that they are not visible from the street</p>
30/12/2013	P102783 (MC1),	54 and 56 Old Street	Approval of details pursuant to condition 4 (materials), 10 (noise assessment), 11 (sound insulation) and 14 (waste strategy) of a planning permission Ref: P102783, granted on 11 April 2011.	<p>The Council raised no objection to the details submitted pursuant to conditions 10 and 11 –Inspector had no reason to disagree. The remainder of this decision deals with the matters in dispute in relation to condition 4 and 14. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the details pursuant to Conditions 4, 10 and 11. The appeal was dismissed insofar as it relates to condition 14 (waste strategy).</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? The Inspector concluded that the materials are appropriate and their use would preserve and</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				enhance the character or appearance of the St Luke's Conservation Area – not agreed by Design & Conservation colleagues. The application for an award of costs is refused.
30/12/2013	P2013/0423/LBC	54 Canonbury Park South	Single-storey side/rear orangery-style extension, including conversion of garage to habitable accommodation and alterations to front façade of existing garage.	<p>Refused due to the unacceptable projection of the extension beyond the rear building line of the house and large footprint. Inspector did not agree and advised the value of the Listed Building and Conservation Area came from the front of the property, and additions to the rear not visible from the public domain were acceptable.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Disappointing decision, Inspector has effectively concluded that Listed Building extensions to the rear are acceptable if not visible from public views.</p>
24/12/2013	P2013/2080/FUL	65 Ambler Road	Second floor addition on top of existing 2 storey flat roofed rear wing.	<p>Modern second storey/ roof extension. Not conservation area.</p> <p>Inspector considered extension not obtrusive or out of character despite unaltered roofline, public views and despite admitting that resulting façade would be 'uncommon'.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? We disagree with decision but maybe hard to refuse 'uncommon' extensions outside conservation areas.</p>
19/01/2014	P2013/2214/FUL	107 Balfour Road	Single storey rear extension and first floor internal alterations.	<p>Inspector did not see validity of concern over design when no public view.</p> <p>As adjoining similar extension – although unauthorised and indeed refused, had still the benefit of lawfulness due to time with no enforcement – so approved.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Must take into account what is actually on the ground. Only say not a precedent if there is</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				the ability to actively enforcement action
04/02/2014	P2013/1597/FUL	6 Avenell Road	Roof extension with 3 roof windows to the front sloping roof.	<p>Inspector noted that 5 out of 20 properties in a terrace had roof extensions and this constituted a compromised roofline.</p> <p>Whilst agreeing design wasn't ideal, noted that it was the same as the neighbours (PD) and similar to others in the wider locality.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Avoid looking at largely unbroken rooflines. Take wider context into account for dormer design.</p>
03/02/2014	P/2012/0555/S19	12 Union Square	Internal alterations on lower ground, first and second floors	<p>Internal works to a listed building. Condition to ensure no partitioning of second floor (harm to plan form) would take place. Inspector thought second floor less significant and considered works to be reversible. This is in contradiction with other appeals but the inspectorate seems to be a bit inconsistent on this matter. However, not a frequent type of case.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Try to avoid such conditions via negotiation (which was, in any event, done in this case).</p>
28/01/2014	P2012/0506/LBC	26 - 27 Cowcross Street	Installation of signage comprising of; 1 set of externally illuminated applied lettering, 1 set of non-illuminated applied lettering, 1 internally illuminated projecting sign, 2 internally illuminated menu boxes, 3 sets of white applied vinyl inside glazing	<p>Part refused and part allowed. The aspects to which Design and Conservation objected were upheld by the Inspector which confirms our reasonable position on the matter. This Inspector contradicted the Advertisement Consent Inspector.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Different consideration under Advertisement Consent and Listed Building Consent. Inspectorate inconsistent</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

29/01/2014	P2013/0017/FUL	Flat 4, 40 Lofting Road	Installation of white UPVC windows	<p>Part allowed part dismissed. Dismissed element related only to one front window. All other windows allowed.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? We feel our decision was correct. This was a retention application and we don't have the ability to part allow/ part dismiss.</p>
04/02/2014	E/2013/0093	102 Blundell Street,	Enforcement Notice served to remove the 14 unauthorised uPVC windows at first and second floor level on the front elevation of the property and reinstate 2/2 timber sash windows, as previously existed.	<p>Appellant argued that property previously in poor state or repair and windows were suitable due to industrial nature of area, also mentioned cost of works. Was also letter of support from a neighbour stating that works were considered an improvement, while no objections submitted by initial complainants.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Inspectorate give limited weight to local listing and place strong emphasis on appearance of surrounding properties.</p>
24/01/2014	P2013/1127/FUL	169 Whitecross Street	Refurbishment of the front façade including new tiling, awning and lighting and painting of existing timber frames. To the rear adding a new roof covering the existing ground floor yard and adding new plant with two new flues. Adding decked area to existing ground floor roof and low level brick wall, timber trellis and planting and timber balustrade enclosing terraced area.	<p>Part allowed part dismissed. The only allowed element related to the retention of the front awning. This was perhaps the least contentious element of the scheme. Inspector argued that mechanism was discrete.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Ensure a strong case for all reasons for refusal of an application</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

10/02/2014	E12/06647	487 Liverpool Road	Enforcement appeal against removal of unauthorised satellite dish from the front elevation of the property	<p>Despite the satellite dish being located in a Conservation Area the Inspector ruled that it did not adversely affect the streetscene, nor did it fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? This is a very disappointing decision, and not one that would cause us to change the way we deal with satellite dishes in Conservation Areas.</p>
11/02/2014	P121155	23 Copenhagen Street	Change of use to residential and opening of front area to basement	<p>The refusal was based on the initial submission, with the design showing a lack of light and outlook for the front bedroom window.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Although the amended scheme improved light and outlook a little, still not outstanding. Inspectorate accepted a different standard, looking at the wider picture and accepting design constraints of a 19th Century property. Also, substantial precedent around.</p>
27/02/2014	P2013/1345/FUL	81 Cloudesley Road	Single storey mansard roof extension to form an additional bedroom and a shower room	<p>This is part of a terrace with 85% roof extension coverage; therefore townscape supported the mansard to complete the terrace. Listed Building Consent issue was over the small remaining original fabric.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Need to consider bigger picture and wider benefits of a scheme.</p>
27/02/2014	P2013/1338/FUL	2 Elthorne Road	Creation of a new external wall around an existing escape stair including a new roof over the stair with a roof light.	<p>Inspector considered that the external wall and roof cladding would not result in a building form that would be visually incongruous and it would not harm the character and appearance of the host building or the surrounding area.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Need to consider overall impact on appearance of building, rather than just concerns with</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

				materials.
28/02/2014	P2013/0370/FUL	Rear of 28 Amwell Street	Conversion of part of existing buildings from storage to residential. Conversion of the former windmill base to B1/D1	<p>The Inspector gave limited weight to the new Planning Brief and the Council's aspiration to create a heritage community use across the whole of the site, as these were not supported by adopted policy which had been through public scrutiny. He did not consider that it had been demonstrated that a viable heritage community use could be provided across the whole site or that this was the optimum viable use for the site.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the proposed B1/D1 use within the first floor of the engine house would be acceptable despite failing to provide inclusive access.</p> <p>The Inspector considered that the harm caused by the proposed internal alterations to the engine house to create a WC within the chimney breast would be outweighed by the public benefit of introducing a new use to the vacant building.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? The site should have been included in the Site Allocations document or protected within an adopted policy in order to provide a solid policy basis for the Council's aspiration to create a community / heritage centre.</p>
28/03/2014	P2013/2535/FUL	22 Fonthill Road	Loft conversion	<p>Inspector noted additions would be modest in scale and in keeping with the Council's design guidance. Due to its location close to the end of the terrace, the rear dormer would be viewed within the wider context of the neighbouring terrace and as such would not be seen as an isolated or incongruous feature.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Note position and proximity of the site to the wider area when considering the protection of the original roofline.</p>

Appendix 1: Allowed Appeals Schedule 2013-14

28/03/2014	P2013/1130/FUL	6 Sudeley Street	Construction of new top/second floor with rear mansard and front terrace	<p>The Inspector deemed that the proposed works would have only a limited impact on the qualities of the listed building, since the additional floor level has already been created and the original roof fabric has been altered. The works were considered to have very limited impact on the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? Matter of 'balance' – seen to be finely balanced but considered that the benefits of the scheme outweigh any harm to the listed building.</p>
25/03/2014	P2013/2479/ADV	301 St John Street	External signage comprising two internally illuminated fascia signs, one double-sided internally illuminated projecting sign and one non-illuminated window vinyl.	<p>The Inspector concluded that the additional three glazed panels did not clutter the building and fitted comfortably within architectural features of the building.</p> <p>Lesson to be learned? In mixed commercial/residential developments the Inspectorate has placed significant emphasis on ground floor commercial character and given its non-designated there appears to be greater flexibility for commercial signage.</p>