



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 August 2019

by R Sabu BA(Hons) MA BArch PgDip ARB RIBA

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3230269

41 & 43 Thornhill Road, Islington, London N1 1JS

- 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 Mitzman Architects LLP against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/0447/FUL, dated 6 February 2019, was refused by notice dated 30 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of twin mansard roof extensions.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of twin mansard roof extensions at 41 & 43 Thornhill Road, Islington, London N1 1JS in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2019/0447/FUL, dated 6 February 2019, 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: 267-DWG-700 P2, 267-DWG-701 P2, 267-DWG-702 P2, 267-DWG-706 P2, 267-DWG-708 P3, 267-DWG-709 P2, 267-DWG-701-RF P2.
 - 3) The external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be constructed in the materials shown on the approved plans and retained as such thereafter.

Procedural Matters

2. While I note the name in the appeal form is stated as Mr R Reynolds, since Mitzman Architects LLP is stated on the application form, the appeal proceeds on this basis.
3. I have omitted the site address in the description of development as it is not an act of development.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the locally listed building and Barnsbury Conservation Area (BCA).

Reasons

5. The site is located within BCA the significance of which lies in the evidence of historical residential architecture in a variety of architectural styles with distinctive detailing. The appeal properties are two storey with an existing mansard roof extension that provides an additional level of accommodation.
6. Nos 41 and 43 Thornhill Road (Nos 41 and 43) are locally listed buildings that from the evidence before me appear to have been semi-detached properties that have been extended over time such that they are no longer symmetrical and are now attached to the adjacent building to become part of a terrace. The significance of Nos 41 and 43 lies in the evidence of shared historical features in particular the central projection on the front elevation with similar window and door designs as well as overall proportions that preserve their distinctive character compared with the rest of the terrace.
7. The proposal consists of roof extensions at both properties that would extend the existing mansard roof extension. They would be a significantly lower height than the existing mansard roof with similar fenestration positioning and detailing. Since Nos 41 and 43 are not symmetrical, the proposal would sit differently in relation to each roof. However, both would be a similar width and height, set a similar distance from the front parapet and would join the existing symmetrical roof extension such that the front elevation would appear balanced.
8. While the proposed extensions would meet the side hip of the existing roof in an uncharacteristic manner and the proposed width would extend across the majority of the existing roof, since they would be significantly set back from the front of the existing roof, the proposal would not appear prominent when viewed from street level. Furthermore, the proposed hipped roof would be of a significantly lower height than the existing mansard roof such that the existing mansard roof and central projection of the front elevation would remain a dominant feature of the host building and the overall proportions of the existing building would not be significantly altered when viewed from the street. Therefore, the proposal would not unduly dilute the features of the properties that contribute to its distinctive character.
9. Since the proposed extension would be located towards the rear of the existing roof, it would be visible from Barnsbury Square. However, the rear of the adjacent properties which can be viewed from Barnsbury Square are more varied in terms of extensions and window treatments than the front of the properties in the area. Therefore, the proposal would not appear incongruous in this respect.
10. I acknowledge the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document January 2017 (SPD) and the Barnsbury Conservation Area Guidelines (Guidelines) which emphasise the importance of the roofline and that the Guidelines does not list the properties as being suitable for roof extensions. However, given that the proposal would not appear incongruous with the character and appearance of the BCA, the proposal would not conflict with the aims of the SPD and the Guidelines to promote and assist in the preservation and enhancement of conservation areas.
11. For the foregoing reasons the proposed development would preserve the character or appearance of the locally listed building and the BCA. Therefore, it would not conflict with Policy 7.8 of the of The London Plan The Spatial Development Strategy for London Consolidated with Alterations since 2011 (London Plan) which requires development affecting heritage assets and their settings to conserve their

significance. It would also not conflict with Policy CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy February 2011 (CS) and Policy DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: June 2013 Development Management Policies (DMP) which respectively seek to protect the borough's unique character and require that alterations to existing buildings in conservation areas conserve or enhance their significance. The proposal would also accord with the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) in this regard.

12. The proposal would also not conflict with the aims of the SPD and the Guidelines which together seek high quality design that makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of an area.

Other Matters

13. I note concerns including those regarding loss of light and privacy to neighbouring occupiers. However, from the evidence before me given the height of the proposal and position of proposed windows, the proposal would not adversely affect the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers with regard to light and privacy.
14. The appeal site lies adjacent to No 45 Thornhill Road, a Grade II Listed Building. Although the Council has not referred to the effect of the proposal on the setting of the nearby listed buildings in their reasons for refusal, I am required, as a statutory consideration, to have regard to these matters when determining the appeal. The significance of the listed building lies in the evidence of historic architecture and given its traditional vernacular appearance, it contributes positively to the character of the BCA.
15. While the appeal site lies adjacent to the listed building, since the proposal would not appear discordant in the BCA and given the reduced height of the proposed roof extension compared to the existing mansard roof, the setting of the listed building would be preserved by the proposal.

Conditions

16. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council. I have made some minor changes to these having regard to the tests set out in paragraph 55 of the Framework and the guidance contained in the Planning Practice Guidance.
17. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have included a condition requiring that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and a condition relating to the external materials. This is in the interest of certainty and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area. I have not included reference to drawings that show the existing building, proposed views of the proposal or are previous revisions of stated drawings as these are not necessary. I have included reference to the existing and proposed second floor plan drawing in the interest of certainty.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

R Sabu

INSPECTOR