



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 July 2017

by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

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

Decision date: 26th July 2017

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3173698

38A Granville Square, Islington, London, WC1X 9PD

- 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 Luke Zuber against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/5004/FUL, dated 19 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is a new terrace, balcony railings and access door to existing rear flat roof.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/Y/17/3173696

38A Granville Square, Islington, London, WC1X 9PD

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Luke Zuber against the decision of London Borough of Islington
 - The application Ref P2016/5055/LBC, dated 19 December 2016, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2017.
 - The works proposed are a new terrace, balcony railings and access door to existing rear flat roof.
-

Decision

1. **Appeal A:** The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new terrace, balcony railings and access door to existing rear flat roof at 38A Granville Square, Islington, London, WC1X 9PD in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2016/5004/FUL, dated 19 December 2016 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: 15-007-P-001, 002, 003 Rev.A, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 Rev. A, 009 Rev. A, 010 Rev.A, 001 Rev. B, Planning Heritage Statement - 20 April 2016; Photo-Sheets, Design and Access Statement April 2016
2. **Appeal B:** The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for a new terrace, balcony railings and access door to existing rear flat roof at 38A Granville Square, Islington, London, WC1X 9PD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P2016/5055/LBC, dated 19 December 2016 subject to the following conditions:

- 1) The works authorised by this consent shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
- 2) The works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 15-007-P-001, 002, 003 Rev.A, 004, 005, 006, 007, 008 Rev. A, 009 Rev. A, 010 Rev.A, 001 Rev. B, Planning Heritage Statement - 20 April 2016; Photo-Sheets, Design and Access Statement April 2016
- 3) Drawings of the railings and new door to a minimum scale of 1:10, and including details of colour and finish and any making good, shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority prior to the relevant part of the works commencing on site. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance the approved details.

Procedural Matter

3. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

Main Issues

4. The main issues relate to the effect of the proposed development and works on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II Listed building and whether the scheme would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the New River Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 3-storey terraced house with a basement and is of stucco lined ashler construction with yellow brick to the first and second floors. To the rear is a 2 storey rear projection which has a flat roof and raised parapet.
6. The appeal property is Grade II Listed as part of a group comprising Nos 34-38, 38A and 38B and 39-41 which forms the north western corner of Granville Square (the Square). The Square was originally planned in 1828 and the dwellings were built 1841-1843. Nos 29-38 were rebuilt in 1864 due to subsidence following the construction of the Metropolitan Railway which runs underneath these dwellings.
7. As evidenced by the listing description, Nos 27-38B, including the appeal property, were then later dismantled and reconstructed by Islington Council in the 1980's and converted to flats. To their front elevations, these dwellings comprise of subtle differences in detailing in comparison to the original dwellings forming the Square, including different fenestration detailing and stucco architraves. That said, the properties appear to be a reasonably faithful reconstruction in terms of their scale, form, use of traditional materials and overall Georgian design ethos, and the combination of these factors provide the building with historic interest. The significance of the listed building can therefore be derived from this building style and detail even though the appeal site was reconstructed in the 1980s. The reconstruction of Nos 27-38B is also significant in respect of aesthetic value in the preservation of the architectural integrity and legibility of the original planned Square.
8. The appeal property is also located within the New River Conservation Area. This covers a reasonably large area which mainly comprises of late 18th and 19th century residential estates. As noted within the Conservation Area Design

Guidelines (2002) the area includes some of the finest terraces and squares in the Borough which has a rare quality and consistency of scale, materials, design and detailing and forms an important part of the significance of the CA.

9. The rear wing of the appeal property has a deeper plan form than projections along the remaining terrace Nos 38B-41 which form part of the north side of Granville Square. To the rear elevation of the appeal property, the fenestration treatment is simple with 2/2 vertical sliding sash windows with no headers serving each floor. Fenestration treatments to the remainder of the terraced properties along No 38B-44 are different to the appeal property with 6/6 glazing bar patterns and arched brick headers and as such the contribution of the rear elevation of appeal property to the consistency and unity of wider listed terrace and CA is reduced.
10. The alteration of an existing third floor window to a door in order to access the roof terrace would elongate and effectively double its length. However, in light of the relatively unassuming fenestration treatment of the appeal property, I do not consider that this would be a discordant addition. Moreover, I find that the introduction of a single and modest revised opening to the rear elevation of No 38A which is markedly different to the remaining terrace would not cause harm to the listed host building or the integrity of the wider building group.
11. The proposed balustrade would be powder-coated metal located atop of the raised parapet to the rear roof. Railings are a common feature found within the area, forming front boundary treatments as well as horizontal cast iron window guards to the full length sash windows. I consider that the detailed design of the balustrade could, reasonably, be conditioned to ensure that it would be in keeping with the design of railings in the wider area.
12. Only oblique views would be gauged across a reasonably tall boundary wall along Granville Street and accordingly, visibility of the terrace and the proposed works from Granville Street would be limited. Moreover, I note there is a reasonable separation distance between the appeal property and this highway and that vegetation to the rear gardens of this part of the terraced dwellings screens much of this area.
13. Due to the limited visibility of No 38A from within the street scene, I also do not consider that accretions relating to the use of the terrace, in terms of planting, furniture or other items, would add any discernible visual clutter to the rear elevation of the listed dwelling, the wider listed terrace or the wider Conservation Area when considered as a whole. The size of the roof terrace would be modest and any such accoutrements would be commensurate to the use of the properties as residential dwellings and thus would not affect the significance of the designated heritage assets in this regard.
14. While there is some uncertainty as to whether other similar developments of roof terraces to the rear of properties in the rest of the Square have secured the necessary consents, such works appear to have been in place for some time. I am also mindful that these appeared as relatively unobtrusive additions with little or no visual clutter.
15. Overall, taking into account the particular circumstances and having carefully considered all the evidence, I conclude that the works would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building and the group listed properties within Granville Square. The works would also preserve the character and appearance of the New River Conservation Area. As such, I

find no conflict with Policy 7.6 and 7.8 of the London Plan (2016) which seek to sustain the significance of heritage assets with development which is sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail. I also consider that the development fully accords with the Islington Core Strategy (2011) in particular policies CS8 and CS9 and policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of the Islington Local Plan: Development Management Policies, which, in combination, require that development should preserve or enhance heritage assets, and good design.

16. The development would also accord with urban design principles for roof terraces as set out within the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) and the Islington Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002). Finally, the development is consistent with the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of the protection and enhancement of designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

17. In respect of the application for planning permission, I note the concerns of occupants at No 49 Wharton Street in respect of a loss of privacy and noise and disturbance. The wider area comprises of relatively high density dwellings where there is a degree of overlooking. While the appeal property is in an elevated position in comparison to dwellings fronting Wharton Street, there would be a separation distance of around 18m and as such I consider that any effects on privacy would not cause material harm.
18. The use of the roof as a terrace would be likely to bring about further external noise, however, in the context of ambient levels in the area arising from the residential dwellings, commercial developments in proximity to the site, as well as road and railway noise, I do not consider that this increase would be significant or harmful. Accordingly, I do not consider that the development would adversely affect living conditions of residents at No 49 or other neighbouring residents.

Conditions

19. Conditions are required in respect of timescales for the works and compliance with the submitted plans and accompanying information for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
20. For the listed building consent, the Council have suggested a generic condition in respect of all external and internal works to match. However, given the scope of the works proposed, I do not consider this to be necessary. Instead, for precision, I have amended the Council's other suggested condition in respect of detailed drawings for the railings and new doorway to also include constructional details, and details of the finish and any making good. Such pre-commencement condition is necessary to ensure that the special architectural and historic interest of the group listed terrace is protected.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both of the appeals should be allowed.

C Searson
INSPECTOR