
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020 by A J Sutton BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/19/3242537

Flat B, 36 Hemingford Road, Islington, London, N1 0JU

- 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 Woodhall and Miss Dickins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/2093/FUL, dated 9 July 2019, was refused by notice dated 11 September 2019.
 - The development proposed is for the addition of a single storey glass room to the rear elevation of the property, at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and Barnsbury Conservation Area (Conservation Area).

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a first-floor apartment in a two storey, locally listed late Georgian mid terrace dwelling located within the Barnsbury Conservation Area. Many of the properties in the row, including the appeal property, have rear first floor outside terrace areas formed on roofs of the single storey outriggers, with stairs accessing rear gardens.
5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect national policy on heritage assets, which includes conservation areas, is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). At paragraph 192, it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets (which in this case includes the Conservation Area and the locally listed building) and the desirability of new

- development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.
6. The Conservation Area is the largest in Islington and contains many of the best examples of late Georgian/early Victorian residential development in London. The appeal property forms part of a late Georgian terrace characterised by a general sense of uniformity both facing the street and to the rear.
 7. The proposed extension would be simple in design, modest in size, and its glazing would allow some sight of the rear elevation of the property. However, the proposed development would substantially enclose the existing terrace area and would introduce a form of development at first floor level, with visible aluminium posts and guttering details, which would be alien to the period property. Although outrigger alterations are evident at the host property and on several other properties in the row, I observed no examples of first floor structures, and a sense of openness prevailed with original architectural features generally in evidence. The proposal would interrupt these positive characteristics. As such it would not be a complementary addition to the host property and would appear an incongruous feature in the wider terrace. The choice of materials and colour would not resolve the discordant appearance of it.
 8. Whilst public views of the development would be restricted, it would be a prominent structure when viewed within the terrace of properties. The harmful appearance would not be sufficiently screened by existing vegetation in surrounding gardens. It would be likely to reduce the appreciation of the quality of the environment within which nearby occupiers live.
 9. Accordingly, I find that the new extension would fail to sustain and enhance the significance of this non-designated heritage asset. The contribution that the host property as extended would make to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area would be diminished. The proposal would neither conserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
 10. Although the harm that would be caused to the significance of this designated heritage asset would be less than substantial, the Framework makes it clear at paragraph 196 that such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The matters advanced in support of the proposal, including providing a covered area for the appellants to enjoy, amounts to a private, rather than a public benefit. Accordingly, I find that no public benefits have been identified which would outweigh the harm identified.
 11. In light of the above I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the Barnsbury Conservation Area and their significance as heritage assets. The proposal conflicts with Policies CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011, DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2013 (Local Plan) and 7.8 of the London Plan 2016 which collectively require the historic significance of Islington's unique heritage assets and historic environment to be conserved and enhanced. There would also be conflict with Policies DM2.1 of the Local Plan and 7.4, and 7.6 of the London Plan 2016, and guidance set out in Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 and Islington's Conservation Area Design Guidelines 2002 which collectively require all forms of development to be of a high quality design which makes a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of an area.

12. Conflict is also found with the design and conserving and enhancing heritage assets policies of the Framework.

Other Matters

13. The character of dwellings on Richmond Road and the wider Conservation Area differ from the appeal property and its immediate setting. As such the examples of similar developments that I have been referred to are not directly comparable and have had limited weight in reaching this recommendation.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR