



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 March 2020

by S Thomas BSc (hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3243425

152 New North Road, Islington, London N1 7BH

- 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 Ben Wheeler against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/2575/FUL, dated 24 August 2019, was refused by notice dated 14 November 2019.
 - The development proposed is described as replacement of existing roof structure with slightly extended structure, having no additional impact on sightlines. Change of materials to more traditional palette.
-

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 Arlington Square Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a town house located within a terrace of properties fronting New North Road within the Arlington Square CA. There is an architectural unity to the terrace of properties with a generally unaltered roofline and a general absence of roof extensions which contributes to the character of this terrace.
4. The Council's Islington Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002) (CADG) identify that the CA around Arlington Square has special architectural and historic interest because of the strong visual unity of the 1840's terraces which contribute to the character of the CA. The appeal property, alongside the rest of the terrace, is included on the Register of Local Listed Buildings for its important street value.
5. The CADG identifies that the ad hoc construction of roof extensions is considered damaging to the architectural unity of the area and roof extensions visible from the street, including long distance views from neighbouring streets, will not be allowed. The Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) states that the roofline is an important factor contributing to the rhythm and uniformity of a residential terrace. It further

states that an extension that projects significantly above or alters the prevailing roofline can often disrupt the characteristic rhythm/unity of the roofline.

6. The proposed extension would replace an existing box dormer extension that currently exists which is a prominent feature uncharacteristic of the existing roof form along this terrace. It would be larger and higher than the existing extension and would be a more visually intrusive and thus incongruent feature. Further, the proposed patio doors to the front elevation would fail to integrate with the architectural character of the existing building. Thus, the proposed extension would not be a sympathetic addition to the building and would disrupt the character of the terrace which is a key feature of the CA.
7. Whilst it is stated that the extension is unlikely to be visible from the principal elevation along New North Road, I observed on my site visit that the existing extension is visible from certain viewpoints in surrounding streets, namely Baring Street and Wilton Square within the CA, and I consider that the proposal would be harmful in these views.
8. I acknowledge that the proposed design of the extension includes a mansard roof to the rear and the use of more sympathetic materials than the existing extension. However, this does not outweigh the harm that this larger structure would have on the architectural unity of the roofline of this terrace.
9. I therefore conclude, that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA resulting in less than substantial harm to the significance of this designated heritage asset. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) says that such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal and that great weight should be given to a designated heritage asset's conservation. In this case the replacement roof extension would serve only as a benefit for the private dwelling and its occupants. There are no public benefits I find which would outweigh the harm I have found to the character or appearance of the CA.
10. Consequently, the proposal would be contrary to the design aims of Policy CS9 of the Islington's Core Strategy (2011) and Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan Development Management Policies (2013) and the Islington Urban Design Supplementary Planning Document (2017). Amongst other matters, these policies seek that heritage assets including Conservation Areas will be conserved, development should make a positive contribution to the local character, and that alterations to existing buildings in Conservation Areas conserve or enhance their significance. The proposal would also be contrary to the Framework and guidance in the CADG.
11. The appellant has referred to an appeal decision in Camden¹ for a roof extension. Whilst the Inspector did not find harm to the character and appearance of the host building in this decision, I do not have the full details of this case before me and the planning context within which this decision was made. Accordingly, I give this limited weight and have, in any event, determined this appeal on its own merits and on the basis of the evidence before me.

¹ APP/X5210/W/17/3168590

Conclusion

12. For the reasons outlined above, the appeal is dismissed.

Stephen Thomas

INSPECTOR