
Appeal Decision

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

by Sarah Housden BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/20/3252199

1A Ellington Street, Islington, London, N7 8PP

- 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 M Burke against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2019/3622/FUL, dated 4 December 2019, was refused by notice dated 20 February 2020.
 - The development proposed is for the construction of a mansard roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of a mansard roof extension and associated alterations at 1A Ellington Street, Islington, London, N7 8PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2019/3622/FUL, dated 4 December 2019, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not 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: Location/Red Line Plan 01, Proposed Elevations & Sections 05, Proposed Floor Plans 04, and Window Section Detail 10.

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.
3. In my formal decision above I have taken the description of the development from the Council's decision notice since it more accurately describes the proposed development.

Procedural Matter

4. The Council is aware that works carried out under planning permission reference P2018/4273/FUL which allowed a third-floor rear infill extension may not accord with the approved plans. Therefore, whilst having regard to this matter, this recommendation is limited to the proposed plans and supporting information submitted for this case and my observations at the site visit.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is whether the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of St Mary Magdalene Conservation Area and the special architectural and historic interest and setting of listed buildings on Ellington Street and Liverpool Road.

Reasons for Recommendation

6. The appeal site is a three-storey dwelling which is not listed but is attached to and forms the end of a Grade II listed terrace of period properties. It has a prominent position near the junction of Ellington Street with Liverpool Road, with its side boundary abutting the rear of Grade II listed properties on that road. It is in the St Mary Magdalene Conservation Area.
7. 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 the Conservation Area. Section 66(1) of the Act also requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving the setting of the adjoining listed buildings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.
8. Islington's Conservation Area Guidelines document (2002) advises the determining authority to have particular regard to roof extensions and dormers, indicating that new roof extensions visible from street level will only be allowed on those terraces where a significant number already exist, with the intention of eventually completing a new and harmonious roof line on these terraces.
9. The Conservation Area comprises a mix of properties dating from the 18th Century to the late Victorian era. Ellington Street is characterised by grand, street facing, period properties in terraces. This characteristic is evident in the short terrace to which the appeal property is attached. The Grade II listed Nos 1 – 15 are unified by period architectural features, including two bay width elevations constructed in stock brick with stucco detailing, round arched openings with sash windows and railing guards, a roof obscured by a parapet and party wall chimney stacks.
10. The Grade II listed buildings fronting Liverpool Road have a mixed character, including the corner pub which was rebuilt in the later 19th Century, with the return wall, near the appeal property altered in the 20th Century.
11. The appeal property, with one bay width and through different architectural detailing varies in appearance from the adjacent properties. However, it appears as a harmonious, later period addition to the terrace.
12. Roof alterations were visible on three of the properties in the terrace adjoining the appeal property which illustrates that roof extensions are not uncharacteristic in the immediate area. The proposed mansard roof would be of a proportionate size that would be sensitive to the unique, existing form of the property. It would be set back from the front parapet and its scale would not overwhelm the small roof space. As such the development would not appear unduly dominant in relation to the host property or particularly uncharacteristic in the historic street scene.

13. When viewed from the Liverpool Road junction, the chimney pots would remain visible as would the top and side sections of the party wall stack. The party wall stack would also remain in clear sight when viewed from within Ellington Street. As such, the proposal would not be harmful to one of the features which contributes to the special architectural and historic interest of the listed property at No 1 Ellington Street. Furthermore, the proposed design, by virtue of its scale, mansard form, retained parapet, cornice detail, fenestration and proposed materials, would ensure that it would not appear as an incongruous extension when viewed in the context of the surrounding period properties. Through these design features, it would not harmfully interrupt any unifying features of the terrace and would not adversely unbalance the appeal property's existing relationship with adjacent grander historic assets.
14. Therefore, the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would preserve the setting of listed buildings on Ellington Street and Liverpool Road and the special architectural and historic interest of No 1 Ellington Street. It would therefore accord with Policies CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011 and DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2013. These policies collectively state that the historic significance of Islington's unique heritage assets and historic environment will be conserved and enhanced whether designated or not and all forms of development are required to be of high quality, incorporate inclusive design principles and make a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness of an area.
15. The proposed development would also be consistent with policies of the London Plan 2016 and the National Planning Policy Framework regarding design and heritage assets.
16. It would generally conform with the advice set out in the Urban Design Guide 2017 and Islington's Conservation Area Design Guidelines 2002 which advises, amongst other matters, there will be particular regard to roof extensions, which will be assessed on merit, giving due weight to design, materials and the cumulative effect on visual amenity, unity and the coherence of the street scene.
17. Paragraph 6.8(ii) of the Guidelines relates to listed properties and therefore No 1a is not included in the list of properties in the Conservation Area where roof extensions may be allowed. In these circumstances, the general guidance in the document applies.
18. Two previous proposals have been refused planning permission. However, I have assessed the proposal on its merits and have found in this case that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, the features of special architectural and historic interest of No 1 Ellington Street and the setting of the adjoining listed properties and would not conflict with the relevant policies for the reasons outlined.

Other Matters

19. Comments regarding the content of submitted documents are noted. However, I have reviewed the submissions from all parties and have found nothing which would alter my recommendation.

Conditions

20. It is necessary for the development to be constructed according to the approved plans in the interest of character and appearance and for reasons of certainty. Requiring materials to match the existing property is unnecessary as the materials proposed are specified on the approved plans.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

22. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be allowed.

Sarah Housden

INSPECTOR