
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 August 2017

by Graham M Garnham BA BPhil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 04 September 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/17/3178135

11 Dagmar Terrace, Islington, London, N1 2BN

- 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 Mike Bienenfeld against the decision of London Borough of Islington Council.
 - The application Ref P2017/1005/FUL, dated 7 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is roof extension to existing house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a roof extension to the existing house at 11 Dagmar Terrace, Islington, London, N1 2BN in accordance with the terms of the application Ref P2017/1005/FUL, dated 7 March 2017, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: numbers 00, 12, 13, 14, 20, 21, 30, 112, 113, 114, 120, 121 & 130.
 - 3) The materials used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be in accordance with the materials detailed on the planning application form, in the Design and Access Statement and as annotated on the approved drawings. The development shall be carried out in accordance with these approved details and maintained as such thereafter.

Main Issue

2. I consider that this is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the house, the terrace and the Cross Street Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 4 storey terraced town house of Georgian or early Victorian origin. It is towards the end of a terrace of 15 similar houses that
-

curve around a sharp bend on Dagmar Terrace, a narrow and quiet side road on the edge of the Cross Street Conservation Area. The Council accepts the principle of roof extensions along the terrace, and has given recent approvals for this type of development at no.s 17 & 20. Thus the roofline of the terrace has been "broken", although the only roof extension I could see from the front, from the church yard opposite, was that at no.20.

4. The application drawings show that neither the roof extension, which would be set back behind the retained front parapet, nor the raised party walls that would support it to either side, would be seen to any material extent from Dagmar Terrace. They might be seen from the church yard when trees shed their leaves, but even then it would be the trees themselves that are the main features in the vista. At the rear, the butterfly form of the back wall would be retained.
5. In the respects noted so far, the proposal would conform with provisions in the *Islington Urban Design Guide* Supplementary Planning Document [IUDG] (2017). This says that there can be scope for roof extensions in conservation areas, where the roofline is broken, particularly where there are a number of existing extensions and the consistency of the roofline has already been compromised. This is the situation at Dagmar Terrace, where in any event the proposal would not harm the appearance of the terrace in the public realm.
6. The IUDG also acknowledges that there is sometimes scope for contemporary extensions on Victorian terraces where such extensions already exist. This is the case in the terrace, and a variety of modern forms and designs can be seen from private gardens and properties at the rear. The proposed design is unashamedly modern. Both front and rear elevations would be largely glazed, under a lead-clad roof with a central ridge and a gentle pitch to either side. The supporting party walls would be in brickwork to match the terrace. The form of the roof would reflect the butterfly profile, albeit inverted and at shallower angles. It would not be out of character with some of the other extensions that can be seen from the rear. Given that the extension would be set back at the front, not be visible in the street scene, and of an appropriate height and scale for the property, I see no substantial reason why it could not be an acceptable design alternative to the more conventional and traditional 'mansard and dormer' type of extension.
7. The *Cross Street Conservation Area Design Guidelines* [CADG] (2002) describe the area as being a mix of retail and residential, characterised by the narrow plot widths and small scale of 17th and 18th century buildings. I observed that Cross Street displays a number of roof forms, with extensions visible from the rear. The Guidelines state that no roof extension will be permitted that is visible from any street level position or public area. Dagmar Terrace has clearly been accepted by the Council as being an exception to this rule. (If the church yard is regarded as being a public area, it is nonetheless outside the conservation area.) The proposed roof extension would not be seen from any public place within the conservation area. I have found it to be acceptable with regards to the host building and the terrace. Hence I also find that it would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area, and not detract materially from a designated heritage asset.

8. My findings are conditional upon the extension being built in accordance with the materials specified in the application and its supporting documents. This is in the interests of a satisfactory appearance, and this outcome needs to be secured through the imposition of a planning condition. In addition, I need to impose a condition specifying the relevant drawings as this provides certainty.
9. Subject to these conditions, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the house, the terrace and the Cross Street Conservation Area. The proposal accords with Policies DM2.1 & DM2.3 in Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2013). Among other things, these policies respectively on design and heritage assets require high standards of design that successfully address the local context, especially the significance of heritage assets. Similarly, I see no material conflict with requirements in Policies CS 8 & CS 9 in Islington's Core Strategy (2011), specifically that the scale of development should reflect the character of the area; the significance of heritage assets and the historic environment is to be conserved; coherent street frontages are to be maintained; and innovative design, of high quality, is welcomed. I have also found no material harm with regards to the local roofline as seen in the public realm, as expected by the IUDG and CADG.
10. The proposal would be in character with its environs and not give rise to harm to the appearance of the conservation area. Thus I am satisfied that the statutory duty with respect to preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area would be fulfilled.
11. There is therefore no reason to withhold planning permission and I allow the appeal.

G Garnham

INSPECTOR