



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 November 2019

by G Pannell BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28th November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/19/3235203

4 Battishall Street, Islington, London N1 1TE

- 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 A Hyland and Mrs M Deuchars against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/0948/FUL, dated 26 March 2019, was refused by notice dated 21 May 2019.
 - The development proposed is erection of mansard rooftop extension at fourth floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. No. 4 Battishill Street is a three storey house located within a terrace of 12 properties. The terrace due to its architectural composition and detailing is representative of the late Georgian/early Victorian style of properties which make up the character of the Barnsbury Conservation Area.
4. I have had regard to the Supplementary Planning Guidance Conservation Area Design Guidelines – CA10 Barnsbury 2002 (SPG) in my assessment of the area. The SPG identifies that the roofline of a street, particularly on a terrace, is a major component of its character. It also identifies that hidden valley roofs behind a parapet are common.
5. In this location the long views available across wide roads mean that the roofscape becomes part of the overall urban landscape. It is for this reason that alterations to the roofline can have a detrimental effect on the character of the Barnsbury Conservation Area, which is experienced from the streets and roads around the area.

6. The roofline of 1-12 Battishill Street has already been altered by the construction of roof extensions to no's 5, 10, 11 and 12. These alterations have resulted in an interruption to the existing roofline, however due to the length of the terrace and the extent of uninterrupted roofline between 1 – 4 Battishill Street and 6 – 9 Battishill Street, the overall unity and consistency has not been compromised.
7. The proposed dormer would have a traditional mansard design with a slate tile roof, lead dormer and timber sash windows and would retain the existing butterfly roof profile at the rear. The design would appear in character with the traditional mansard roofs which are evident within the Conservation Area.
8. However, the dormer would fill the entire footprint of the roof and would be set back from the front parapet by approximately 0.3m. As a result, it would be a prominent feature interrupting the existing roofline. Moreover, the dormer would be widely visible from within Waterloo Terrace and Almeida Street. The width of Battishill Street also allows views of the existing roof form. Thus, any further interruption to it would be visible from the public realm, resulting in a development which is an unduly dominant and incongruous element within the terrace, disrupting its rhythm and unity.
9. I conclude therefore that the proposed development would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area. This would be contrary to policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011 and policies DM2.1, DM2.3 and DM4.8 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2013, the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Guidance 2017 and the Supplementary Planning Guidance Conservation Area Design Guidelines – CA10 Barnsbury. These policies seek to protect and enhance the character and appearance of Islington and its built and historic environment.
10. In line with paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), I afford the harm that would arise to the heritage asset great weight. Given that the proposal would be of a relatively small scale in the context of that of the Conservation Area, I find the harm to the heritage asset to be less than substantial in this instance.
11. Under such circumstances, paragraph 196 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst the appellant has outlined some personal benefits associated with the scheme, such as their desire to remain in the local area, I do not consider that this would be a public benefit. Therefore, there is no public benefit sufficient to outweigh the harm.

Other Matter

12. I have had regard to the fallback position afforded by the grant of planning permission for a similar development (P/2019/0947/FUL). However, I am of the opinion that in that case the setback of approximately 2m would limit the views from the public realm and would be less harmful than that which is before me. As such, the availability of a fallback position would not outweigh the harm I have identified here.

13. I note that the development would not have a harmful effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents. However, the lack of harm in such respects would not outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

G. Pannell

INSPECTOR