

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2017

by Janet Wilson BA (Hons) BTP MRTPI DMS

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

Decision date: 23rd May 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/17/3171520

19 Danbury Street, Islington, LONDON N1 8LD

- 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 Ms Shelley against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/4396/FUL, dated 8 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 23 December 2016.
 - The development proposed is replacement of existing inverted roof with a mansard roof incorporating a bedroom, en-suite and roof terrace and the addition of a window at first floor on the gable elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Ms Shelley against the Council of the London Borough of Islington. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The application is described as 19 Danbury Street on the original application form. The property is referred to elsewhere as 27½ Gerrard Road including the decision notice and other appeal documents. I noted on my visit that this property does not have a front door on the Danbury Street frontage; this is situated on Gerrard Road. Notwithstanding these differences it is clear that the two addresses are one and the same property and I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
4. The appellant draws attention to the Council's error in its description of the property as being locally listed when it is not in fact subject to such listing (despite the remainder of the terrace being so). The Council have accepted that they made this error and I have considered the appeal on that basis.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the development on the street-scene and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row Conservation Area (CA).
-

Reasons

6. The property, along with many of the surrounding terraces, is located within a mainly residential part of the CA, which is characterised by Georgian and Victorian terraces. The area has an architectural rhythm which contributes to its special character and forms part of its significance. This is recognised in the Islington Conservation Area Design Guidelines (January 2002) (CADG) which state that the characteristics of the area demand sensitive policies for preservation and enhancement. The guidelines list this property as one where the Council may permit a traditional roof extension.
7. The appeal building is at the end of a short terrace. It is a taller structure than the remainder of the terrace with grander architectural detail which increases its prominence on Danbury Street. The detailing at ground floor wraps around onto and reflects that found along Gerrard Road where it is connected to the adjacent property by a boundary wall. The appellant states that only limited public views of the rear roof can be appreciated. I saw on my visit that the rear elevation is visible along Gerrard Road and has particular prominence due to the fact that it occupies a corner, is higher than remaining properties in the same terrace and because of the gap between the building and its neighbour on Gerrard Road. Any changes to the rear roof in this context would be visible.
8. Appeal evidence details that a previous mansard roof extension was granted permission at this property in February 2014. The appeal proposal replicates very similar detailing to the front elevation and with the same height and profile alterations proposed to the flank wall, the party parapet wall and chimney stacks. However at the rear the appeal scheme represents a more modern design. The proposed mansard roof would span approximately one third of the width of the property at its outer edge, the remaining two thirds would be recessed back. This would surround a roof terrace with a plain glazed screen located in the butterfly V of the existing roof line.
9. The modern detailing coupled with the visual prominence of the building would result in a striking addition to the roof. The outer third, being set forward, would appear taller and would present an asymmetrical appearance which would be overly dominant and out of keeping, at odds with the architectural integrity of the building and the character of the area. It would materially change the appearance of, and unbalance, the rear elevation above the butterfly roof adding a discordant element and disrupting the architectural rhythm. This would be harmful to the appearance of the dwelling and the characteristics of the CA.
10. Representations have been made from the local Angel Association objecting to both the design of the roof extension which they consider is out of keeping and obtrusive on a conspicuous site. They also object to the insertion of the window at first floor in the flank or gable elevation. The Council have confirmed that they do not object to the insertion of the window. However flank walls in this part of the CA are predominantly blank, and are strong features in their own right which add to the character of the area. Puncturing the wall with a single window would dilute this and be harmful to the character of the area.
11. The statutory duty in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a heritage asset, in this case the Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row CA, is a matter of considerable

importance and weight. This design, in this particular location, would have an adverse effect on the significance of the designated heritage asset and would result in "less than substantial" harm in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).

12. The appellant has stated that the proposal meets the aims of the Framework in that it assists the deliverance of a wide choice of quality homes, makes effective use of an existing building and is sustainable. There is no indication that the extension is required in order to secure the property's optimum viable use nor that it meets a need for a particular size of home in the area. Furthermore, I consider that the benefit of providing additional accommodation would be a private benefit for the appellant rather than providing a wider public benefit. Accordingly, these matters are not of sufficient weight to outweigh the harm identified to the heritage asset.
13. I have also had my attention drawn to other roof extensions and the creation of roof terraces in the vicinity of the site which have been approved in the past. The appellant seeks to rely on an apparent lack of consistency in relation to the appeal proposal. I looked at the examples referred to in evidence during my visit including those visible from the upper floors of the appeal property. I observed that there are differences in the details of these examples and equally most are not as visible in longer range views within the CA as the appeal proposal would be. I did see examples of modern details on mansards close to the site but these examples were not as visually prominent in the streetscape. In any case, I have come to my own conclusion and determined the appeal on its own merits having regard to the statutory test.
14. For the reasons set out, the development would be harmful to the significance of the CA and it would neither preserve nor enhance its character or appearance. It would be in conflict with Policies 7.4 and 7.6 of the London Plan (2015), policy CS8 of Islington's Core Strategy (2011), policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Development Management Policies (2013) and guidance within the Islington Urban Design Guide and the Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row Conservation Area Design Guidelines. These policies together seek to protect local character, ensure heritage assets are conserved or enhanced and secure high quality details based on the defining characteristics of the area.

Other matter

15. The local Angel Association have also made representations that the extent of the glazing on this conspicuous site would lead to light pollution. I agree that the prominence of the extension would be greater in the hours of darkness however I have not found this issue to be determinative in relation to this appeal.

Conclusion

16. The development fails to comply with the development plan and does not amount to sustainable development and for the above reasons, and having considered all matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Janet Wilson

INSPECTOR