

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2017

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 10 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/16/3164762

16 Florence Street, Islington, London N1 2DX

- 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 Alexandre Duriez against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/2979/FUL, dated 26 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 20 September 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a partial roof extension on top of an existing 4-storey Victorian terraced house to form an additional room of approximately 15m²; the visible part of one previously removed original chimney stack is reinstated.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council, in its decision notice refers to Islington's Conservation Area Design Guidelines (the CADG) and the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the UDG) to which I have applied some weight due to their role in supporting the relevant development plan policies.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Upper Street (North) Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

4. The site is located in the CA and as such special attention has to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
 5. The terrace in which No 16 is located is recorded in the Islington Register of Locally Listed Buildings and Locally Significant Shopfronts (April 2010) as a three storey and semi-basement classical terrace of houses and as being a good representation of the period, with special street value. The dwellings in the terrace have a strong and pleasing degree of uniformity at the front with few material alterations or additions visible.
 6. A prominent break to that uniformity at roof level, of those running along the eastern side of the road, relates to a roof extension to No 10 which is clearly visible from public vantage points at the front and rear. I have received no details of the planning circumstances of that development. However, although
-

not of the same design as that proposed, it serves to highlight the effect and dominance of such a roof extension on the visual appreciation of the otherwise generally uniform roof line.

7. There are various extensions to the rear of the terrace, including to No 16. However, with the exception of the roof extension to No 10, these remain generally subservient to the dwellings concerned. The 'V' shapes of the valley roofs remain a distinct and prominent feature, providing a pleasing rhythm to the roof line and making a positive contribution to the significance of the locally listed terrace. That feature is clearly visible from surrounding private properties, but this is also the case from the public realm of Tressel Close to the north-east of the site and from Hawes Street to the south, albeit that these are outside of the CA. The terrace, front and back, therefore makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA as experienced both from within and outside of it.
8. The proposed development would be unlikely to be visible from the street level in Florence Street, as it would be screened by the existing parapet wall. As such, in this respect it would preserve the character and appearance of the CA as appreciated from the public realm at the front of the site.
9. To the rear, the proposal would not break the 'V' line of the rear elevation. However it would be close to that rear elevation and rise above the roofline. As such, due to its significant height, width and general massing effect, it would draw the eye disproportionately away from that distinct 'V' line feature of the valley roofs. The large glazed window area, significantly and disproportionately larger than those existing windows on the upper floors of the rear elevation of the dwelling, would also serve to draw further attention to the extension. For these reasons, along with that roof extension to No 10, the proposal would cause a further and harmful distraction from the generally consistent rhythm of the terrace's rear roof line, as seen from those vantage points relating to the rear of the terrace referred to above.
10. The proposal would utilise contemporary materials in respect of the cladding and window frames. However, the grey colour would complement the grey of the slate roof and so in itself would be unlikely to be a significant contributory factor to the harm that I have otherwise found would be caused.
11. The proposal includes the reinstatement of a chimney stack which would be a benefit of the proposal but not one that would mitigate or outweigh the harm that would otherwise be caused by the proposed extension. I have also not received any substantive evidence that such reinstatement could not be carried out independently of the proposed extension, subject to any planning permission that may be required.
12. The appellant claims that the proposed design takes into consideration the concerns raised by my colleague in respect of another appeal relating to a roof extension to No 9, Ref APP/V5570A/00/1055112, that was dismissed in 2001. That was a number of years ago, and I have not received any details relating to the case, including the relevant development plan policies at that time, to enable a proper analysis in this respect. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) has also since been published which represents a material factor in considering the current appeal. In any case, I have determined this appeal on its own merits based on all of the evidence before me and my site visit observations.

13. Having regard to paragraphs 132 and 134 of the Framework, harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial due to the small scale of development in the context of the CA as a whole. I acknowledge that the appellant wishes to extend the dwelling to address his family's urgent need for additional living space. However, this benefit, together with that of reinstating a chimney stack, would be insufficient to outweigh that harm, and I have not received substantive evidence of any other public benefits relating to the proposal that would do so.
14. For the above reasons, the proposed development would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, it would be contrary to policy CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy, policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies and the CADG and UDG, which together require development to conserve and enhance the historic significance of Islington's heritage assets and historic environment.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR