



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 November 2017

**by D J Board BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 12<sup>th</sup> January 2018.**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3181481**

**2 Rosoman Place, Islington, London, EC1R 0JX**

- 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 Matthias & Joanna Arnsdorf & Dawes against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
  - The application Ref 2017/1164/FUL, dated 16 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 12 May 2017.
  - The development proposed is described as *"Minor infill extension to the existing rear terrace and an addition of a small roof top extension with a minimal glazed access stair. Introduction of two new windows on the side elevation as well as the lowering of two window openings to masonry side elevation and replacement of existing single glazed windows with new double glazed casement throughout. Relocation of front door from Rosoman Place to Northampton Row and the replacement of the ground floor window and existing entrance doorway with a single window opening on the front elevation, with alterations to the front facade to mirror existing architectural features in the locality"*.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for Minor infill extension to the existing rear terrace and an addition of a small roof top extension with a minimal glazed access stair. Introduction of two new windows on the side elevation as well as the lowering of two window openings to masonry side elevation and replacement of existing single glazed windows with new double glazed casement throughout. Relocation of front door from Rosoman Place to Northampton Row and the replacement of the ground floor window and existing entrance doorway with a single window opening on the front elevation, with alterations to the front facade to mirror existing architectural features in the locality at 2 Rosoman Place, Islington, London, EC1R 0JX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2017/1164/FUL, dated 16 March 2017, subject to the condition in Annex A.

## Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the existing property and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Rosebery Avenue Conservation Area (CA)

## Reasons

3. The Council's Conservation Area Guidelines (CAG) establish that there is a variety of existing roof forms in the area and different streets have markedly different roof characters. In particular that these roof forms and details are an important part of the visual and architectural character and appearance of the buildings and wider CA. The CA in this location is characterised by a

variety of building heights and designs. No 2 Rosoman Place is an end of terrace house that is attached to a large former warehouse. There is no dispute that it is early 20<sup>th</sup> century and has already been extended. In particular a roof extension and additions at first and second floor levels.

4. I appreciate that changes would be made to the windows and door on the front elevation. There would also be an infill extension to the rear of the building atop the existing building. The extension would increase the height of the building. However, the additional floor would be set back from the front. The design and material finish of the extensions would echo the existing additions to the building with the use of similar style windows with appropriate proportions and detail. As such the additions would sit comfortably on the host property and within the wider area.
5. Views of the additions from the pavement directly outside the site would be limited. The building and the addition would be visible within the wider street scene. The long range views from the nearby park already contain roof additions and taller buildings. Within this context the addition, which is well proportioned and detailed, would not stand out. Overall its presence would not significantly alter the variety of property styles in this part of the CA.
6. I appreciate that the (CAG) also sets out that roof extensions which are visible from the street or other public areas will not be permitted. The Islington Urban Design Guide (UDG) also refers specifically to roof extensions. This is clear that such extensions should be considered against the local context, the terrace within which it would sit, quality of design and material finish and that they will be judged on their merits. In conservation areas it goes on to say that whether the roofline is broken or not will be considered as well as the particular street frontage in question. In this case I do not consider that the architectural form proposed would be out of place in the context of the area, it would not break a roof line and would be a good quality of material finish and design.
7. Therefore, in my judgement, the proposed additions would have a neutral effect on the character or appearance of the CA and so would preserve it. Therefore it would not be in conflict with London Plan Policies 7.4 and 7.8, Development Management Policies DM2.1, DM2.3 which amongst other things require new development to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the respective area it would also not be in conflict with paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which indicates that planning should conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

#### *Other matters*

8. I have carefully considered the other issues raised in the response received from an interested party. In particular it raises the issue of loss of daylight. The Council have not included this in the reasons for refusal. However, the appellants have submitted a copy of a 25 degree daylight test with their statement of case. I appreciate that the external staircase referred to by the appellants on the adjacent approved scheme has not been built out. Nevertheless, the submission demonstrates that a very limited amount of the appeal scheme itself would breach the test. As such I do not consider that the scheme could be resisted on this issue and it does not alter my conclusion on the main issue.

### **Conditions and Conclusion**

9. The Council has suggested three conditions. I have considered the suggested conditions in the light of the relevant tests in paragraph 206 of the Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition it is necessary to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. The third condition relates to the materials for the scheme and would be necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.
10. Therefore, for the above reasons and having regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*D J Board*

INSPECTOR

## **Annex A – 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: WK/2540/050 REV A; WK/2540/001 REV A; WK/2540/002 REV A; WK/2540/003 REV A; WK/2540/004 REV A; WK/2540/006 REV A; WK/2540/007 REV B; WK/2540/008 REV B; WK/2540/009 REV B; WK/2540/101 REV A; WK/2540/102 REV B; WK/2540/103 REV B; WK/2540/104 REV B; WK/2540/105 REV B; WK/2540/106 REV A; WK/2540/107 REV A; WK/2540/108 REV A; WK/2540/109 REV B; Design and Access Statement dated March 2017.
- 3) No development shall take place until samples of all external facing materials have been submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The details and samples shall include: a) render (including colour, texture and method of application); b) window and door treatment (including sections and reveals); c) balustrade; and d) any other materials to be used. The relevant works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved sample details.