



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 14 December 2020

by J Hunter BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 December 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/20/3256986

1, Gatcombe Road, Islington N19 4PT

- 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 J Saumarez-Smith against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2020/1362/FUL, dated 25 May 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 July 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as alterations to existing single storey side garage extension with the addition of a pitched, slate roof and inverted dormer to the rear roof slope.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to existing single storey side garage extension with the addition of a pitched, slate roof and inverted dormer to the rear roof slope at 1 Gatcombe Road, Islington N19 4PT in accordance with the terms of planning application Ref: P2020/1362/FUL, dated 25 May 2020 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: 110 Proposed Ground Floor Plan, 210 Proposed Street Elevation, 212 Proposed Side Elevation (Section A), 213 Proposed Rear Elevation, 001 Location Plan and Block Plan, 003 Proposed Site Plan and Ground Floor Layout.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr J Saumarez-Smith against the Council of the London Borough of Islington. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal building is a modest single storey garage located immediately adjacent to and within the grounds of 1 Gatcombe Road, a two storey, brick built semi-detached house. At present the garage has a flat roof and is set back from the highway by around 2 metres, it is subordinate in scale to the surrounding buildings and therefore relatively inconspicuous in the street scene.
5. The surrounding area is predominantly residential and is characterised by attractive Victorian terraces and villas of varying scale and with an array of pleasant architectural detailing. The appeal property is close to but outside of the boundaries of the Mercers Road/Tavistock Terrace Conservation Area (CA).
6. The glossary to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) defines the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which it is experienced confirming that its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Paragraph 200 of the Framework states that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to, or better reveal the significance of, the asset should be treated favourably.
7. I consider that as a whole, the scale, massing, rhythm and architectural detailing of the Victorian properties and streets that surround the CA make a positive contribution to its setting, which in turn makes a positive contribution to the significance of the designated heritage asset that is the CA. However, the appeal building itself is of neutral consequence in this regard. This is because although constructed in materials that blend with the overall street scene it is a relatively modern insertion that is devoid of architectural detailing and does not therefore in itself make a positive contribution.
8. The proposal would see the conversion of the existing garage into additional accommodation for the adjoining property including a replacement roof, and window and door alterations. The increased height of the building would result in the garage being more prevalent in the street scene however, it would remain subservient to the host property and indeed its scale would not exceed that of the nearby outriggers and extensions in the immediate vicinity. Furthermore, the use of complementary materials and finishing would be compatible with the host property and the wider street scene thus reducing any impact on views into the site and towards the CA. In addition, I consider that whilst the proposed roof slope would add bulk to the building, from the front, it would mimic the pitch of the host property thus improving the aesthetics of the building overall.
9. I note the Council's concerns in relation to the unusual roof arrangement to the rear and the inclusion of an inverted window. However, I saw during my site visit that the rear of the roof would only be visible from very limited private vantage points and given the existing range of modern and traditional roof forms in the locality it would not appear incongruous or unsympathetic to the location, despite its modern appearance.
10. For the preceding reasons the proposal would not have a detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. In the parlance of paragraph 196 of the Framework, the proposal would have a neutral effect on the setting of the CA and therefore on the contribution it makes to the

significance of the heritage asset. It is not therefore necessary for me to weigh any public benefits into the planning balance.

11. Accordingly, the proposal would comply with the Framework as well as Policy CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy 2011 and Policy DM2.1 of the Islington Local Plan, Development Management Policies 2013 which require developments to be of high quality design that contribute to local distinctiveness.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

J Hunter

INSPECTOR