The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 May 2020

by M Heron BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th June 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3245686
Flat A, 341 Caledonian Road, Islington, London N1 1DW

- 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 Huseyin Guzel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
- The application Ref P2019/3448/FUL, dated 11 November 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 January 2020.
- The development proposed is a roof extension – new mansard.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether or not the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area, with particular regard to its effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace to which it belongs.

Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within the Barnsbury Conservation Area (CA). I therefore have a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of this CA. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also advises that great weight must be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and any harm which is less than substantial must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal.

4. In considering the significance of this CA, this derives from excellent examples of formal late-Georgian/early-Victorian development. This includes some of the finest sequences of terraces in London. The appeal building is a three storey property with a ground floor shop and residential accommodation on the floors above. It is located towards the centre of a row of terraced properties which are broadly consistent in height. Most of these, including No 341, have valley roofs hidden behind a front parapet. This largely unaltered shared roofscape, together with a common scale and similar architectural detailing, gives this terrace a strong sense of rhythm and uniformity. Overall, it is typical of the architecture within the CA and contributes positively to its character and appearance.

5. This proposal seeks permission to construct a new mansard roof to No 341. Although stepped back from the front parapet, a section of this new roof would

be visible above this feature. The appeal building would therefore appear notably taller than adjoining properties, which would disrupt their rhythm and uniformity when viewed from the front. This would be particularly evident from the nearby Oxford Road which provides long distance views towards the top of the host building.

6. In addition, whilst the proposed roof would not remove the existing valley roof to the rear, it would extend close to it and above it and would cover the full width of the roof. Consequently, the proposal would add a considerable amount of bulk and mass above the valley roof. This would diminish the pleasing contribution that it makes to the design of No 341 and would further disrupt the rhythm and uniformity of the terrace as a whole. The eye would be drawn to such harm by the differing sizes of the windows in the rear elevation of the proposal, which would not relate well to the size and positioning of windows on the floors below.

7. Taking all of the above into account, the proposal would represent an incongruous addition to No 341 that would fail to integrate effectively with its design and the rhythm of the terrace to which it belongs. This would harm the character or appearance of the CA. This harm would be localised and would therefore be less than substantial within the meaning of the Framework. No public benefits of the scheme have been put forward by the appellant and none are evident through my own assessment. Consequently, it has not been demonstrated that there are sufficient public benefits to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA.

8. For these reasons, the proposal conflicts with Policy CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy, Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies and Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8 of The London Plan. Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that proposals have regard to the form, function and structure of an area, are of high architectural quality and conserve or enhance heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance. The scheme would also conflict with the guidance within Islington's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and the Conservation Area Design Guidelines insofar as they only seek to support roof extensions which are sympathetic to the host building and harmonise with the predominant roofline in the vicinity.

Other Matter

9. My attention has been drawn to the existence of similar roof extensions in the immediate area. However, no specific examples have been provided. In the absence of details about how or when such developments were assessed, they carry little weight in my assessment of the appeal scheme, which I have performed based on its individual planning merits in any event.

Conclusion

10. The proposal would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations, including the advice of the Framework, which outweigh this conflict. I therefore conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

M Heron

INSPECTOR