
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: 2 May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3167249

Flat 1 and 2, 284 Caledonian Road, London, N1 1BA

- 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 A Panayi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/3684/FUL, dated 17 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is a rear bedroom extension to first floor flat with minor internal alterations to make a larger one bedroomed unit including alterations to roof; and the addition of a parapet to Flat 1 below.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a rear bedroom extension to the first floor flat with minor internal alterations to make a larger one bedroomed unit, including alterations to roof; and the addition of a parapet to Flat 1 below at Flat 1 and 2, 284 Caledonian Road, London, N1 1BA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2016/3684/FUL, dated 17 May 2016, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin no later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1, 2, 3 and 4 received by the Council on 3 October 2016, and the Design and Access Statement.
 - 3) The full length window on the first floor, hereby approved, shall have top hung openings, as shown on the approved plan No 3, and shall remain as such thereafter.
 - 4) The roof area of the extension hereby permitted shall not be used as a balcony, roof garden or similar amenity area.
 - 5) All new facing materials shall match those of the existing building.

Main Issue

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

Reasons

3. 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.

4. The appeal building is a 5 storey mid-terraced property. The first floor extension would be shallow and only about half the width of the existing rear elevation. It would not project out as much as the ground floor extension, over which it would be built. Therefore it would be very small and add very little bulk to the original building, which is of a substantial size.
5. The increased height of the proposed parapet wall on the ground floor extension would be negligible and would make hardly any difference to the overall appearance of the building. Overall, I consider the scale and massing of the proposal to be appropriate.
6. The original windows in the floors above the proposed extension have a strong vertical emphasis. The proposed windows in the extension, being full height and divided into 4 panes, would be reflective of this vertical emphasis. An existing window would also be replaced by a larger sash window which I consider to be proportionate to the windows in the original rear elevation. I therefore find the proposed window designs to be acceptable.
7. Painted render is a common feature of the conservation area and so I consider it to be an appropriate facing material. It would provide a pleasing relief to the wider expanse of brick on the rear elevation.
8. I conclude that the proposed extension would preserve the character and appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area. I therefore find no conflict with Policies DM2.1 or DM2.3 of the Islington Local Plan Development Management Policies, 2013. These policies seek to ensure that development is of a high quality design which conserves or enhances conservation areas. I find no conflict with Islington's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, 2017, which has similar objectives. Neither, do I find conflict with Islington's Conservation Area Design Guidelines which seek to ensure that rear extensions are of a suitable scale, design and materials.

Other Matters

9. I have had regard to representations from interested parties. As the ground floor flat has large rear windows, I do not consider that the relocation of the roof-light would harm the living conditions of its occupiers in respect of sunlight or daylight. I also note objections to the use of the roof as a terrace but, in order to avoid the overlooking of neighbouring gardens, planning conditions will prevent this happening. I have considered all other matters but none outweigh the conclusions I have reached.

Conditions

10. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary, in the interests of precision, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. A condition in respect of materials is necessary in the interests of visual amenity. In the interests of living conditions I impose conditions to prevent the roof being used as a terrace.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons, I allow the appeal subject to the conditions.

Siobhan Watson

INSPECTOR