

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 April 2017

by Siobhan Watson BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI

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

Decision date: 28 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3167580

First floor flat, 237 Caledonian Road, London, N1 0NG

- 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 Andrew Panayi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/4080/FUL, dated 10 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 19 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a first floor rear extension to provide additional living space in relation to the existing flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. I have used the Council's description of development as it is more succinct than the one on the application form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed extension would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The Barnsbury Conservation Area contains good examples of formal late-Georgian/early Victorian residential development, much of which is set out in squares and terraces. Brick and smooth white painted render are common facing materials.
 5. The appeal building is the end property of a tall terrace. It is mainly faced in brick but also contains areas of white render on the parapets and around the front windows. There is a single storey structure at the front of the building housing a traditional timber shopfront which wraps around the corner of the property.
 6. The proposed first floor extension would be about $\frac{3}{4}$ the width of the rear elevation, it would project just over half the depth of the projection below, and it would have a low profile pitched roof. It would therefore be a small structure in comparison to the parent building. Translucent glazing panels would be the predominant material on the side elevations and there would be full-height and width glazing to the rear.
 7. Paragraph 10.18 of Islington's Conservation Area Design Guidelines (ICADG) indicate that full width rear extensions, higher than one storey or half width
-

rear extensions, higher than two storeys, will not normally be permitted. Given that the extension is neither full width nor higher than two storeys, I find no conflict with this particular paragraph of the guidance. I find the height, bulk, massing and scale of the proposed extension to be acceptable.

8. That said, paragraph 10.2 of the ICADG indicates that extensions should normally be constructed in traditional materials. Given the predominant use of masonry on the host building, I consider that the extensive use of panelled glazing, in an elevated position, would look discordant in comparison. Consequently, in spite of its appropriate scale, the detailed design and use of unsympathetic materials would result in the extension harming the character and appearance of the building. The extension would also be clearly visible from Stanmore Street and it would therefore harm the wider street-scene.
9. I appreciate that there is glazing on the single storey shop front projection, but this element of the building is on the ground floor and is physically separate to the proposed extension. I note the appellant's intention to provide planters containing evergreen shrubs along the edge of the terrace, but planting cannot be considered to be permanent and therefore, this would not overcome the inappropriate design of the extension. I appreciate that Islington's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (IUDGSPD) allows for extensions on upper floors but for the above reasons, I find this particular proposal to be unacceptable. I also note that there have been no objections from neighbours but this factor is not determinative.
10. S72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a statutory duty upon me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. The extension would be incongruous with its surroundings but, as a small structure, it would cause less than substantial harm to the special interest and significance of the conservation area.
11. In these circumstances paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework says that the harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The extension would create a larger flat with two bedrooms instead of one but I have no reason to believe that this would be a public benefit. In consequence, I do not consider that there are public benefits of the proposal sufficient to outweigh the harm I have found.
12. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area. Consequently, I find conflict with Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of the Islington Local Plan Development Management Policies, 2013; and CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy, 2011. These policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design which conserves or enhances conservation areas. I also find conflict with IUDGSPD, 2017 and the ICADG which have similar objectives.

Conclusion

13. I have taken into account all other matters raised but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached and the appeal is dismissed.

Siobhan Watson INSPECTOR