



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2021

by Joanna Gilbert MA (Hons) MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th May 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/20/3264970

Maisonette Flat, 301 Caledonian Road, Islington, London N1 1DT.

- 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 Andrew Panayi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
- The application Ref P2020/2584/FUL, dated 23 September 2020, was refused by notice dated 19 November 2020.
- The development proposed is proposed loft extension to existing maisonette flat which is situated on the First and Second Floors.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for proposed loft extension to existing maisonette flat which is situated on the First and Second Floors at Maisonette Flat, 301 Caledonian Road, Islington, London N1 1DT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2020/2584/FUL, dated 23 September 2020, subject to the three 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: Site Location Plan; 7520/01 Existing Second Floor Plan and Existing Roof Plan; 7520/02 Proposed New Third Floor Extension and Proposed Roof Plan; 7520/03 Existing and Proposed Carnoustie Drive Elevations; 7520/04 Existing Tilloch Street Elevation; 7520/05 Proposed Tilloch Street Elevation; 7520/06 Existing Section A-A; 7520/07 Proposed Section A-A; 7520/08 Proposed and Existing Front Elevation; Design and Access Statement dated 23 September 2020 Ref 7520/01.
 - 3) The development shall be constructed in accordance with the materials set out in the Design and Access Statement dated 23 September 2020 Ref 7520/01. The development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the materials so approved and shall be maintained as such thereafter.

Procedural Matters

2. The new London Plan was adopted in March 2021. I have considered the appeal accordingly.
3. I visited this appeal site and the appeal site at 334 - 340 Caledonian Road¹ on the same day. Both appeals are for roof extensions to terraced properties along

¹ APP/V5570/W/20/3265155

Caledonian Road. They lie close to one another on opposite sides of the road within the Barnsbury Conservation Area. While the sites are geographically separate and distinct, for consistency I have conjoined the appeals due to a shared main issue relating to their effect on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Although I have reached different conclusions in the two appeals due to their site-specific circumstances, much of the background documentation is similar for both appeals.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property at 301 Caledonian Road is part of a short terrace of buildings at 299 – 311 Caledonian Road located within the Barnsbury Conservation Area and the Kings Cross and Pentonville Road Core Strategy Area. The terrace fronts the western side of Caledonian Road. The ground floor of the appeal property is in commercial use with residential use on the upper two floors. The terrace adjoins Kember Street to the north, Caledonian Road to the east, Tilloch Street to the south, and Carnoustie Drive to the west.
6. Both 299 and 301 Caledonian Road are older buildings with V shaped roofs, while 303 – 311 Caledonian Road is a more modern flat-roofed development following a largely similar building line. Despite the differences in architecture on the terrace including a two-storey frontage at Nos 303 - 311, the second floor of Nos 299 – 311 is set back from Caledonian Road in a similar fashion. The northern end of Nos 303 – 311 turns the corner onto Kember Street and includes a taller four-storey element at 1 Kember Street. This is set back behind the aforementioned second floor frontage.
7. The proposed development is for a mansard roof extension to No 301. It would involve the removal of the existing chimney stacks to both sides of the roof. The mansard extension would be set behind the parapet wall and would be set back from the upper floor frontage.
8. The conservation area's significance is largely derived from its late Georgian and early Victorian architecture. In addition to fine sequences of squares and residential terraces, the conservation area contains shopping frontages along Caledonian Road and Liverpool Road. Rooflines of streets, particularly for terraces, form a significant component of the area's character and appearance.
9. Paragraphs 5.145 – 5.149 of the Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (the SPD) provides general advice on roof extensions, while paragraphs 5.150 - 5.152 concentrate on rooflines in conservation areas and paragraphs 5.154 – 5.158 on main types of roof extension. The Council has referred specifically to the first sentence of paragraph 5.154, but as the proposed development is for a single storey to the roof, the proposed development appears compliant with the SPD in this sense.
10. The SPD confirms that it is necessary to consider the particular terrace within which the host building sits and the local context. Within conservation areas, the SPD asserts that the roofline is often important in contributing to an area's character and therefore proposals for roof extensions anywhere along an

unaltered roofline within a conservation area will not generally be acceptable. Beneath paragraph 5.150 of the SPD, there are a number of criteria set out for consideration with regard to roof extensions in conservation areas.

11. Notwithstanding the Council's concerns that the older buildings at Nos 299 – 301 do not form part of a terrace with Nos 303 – 311, I confirmed during my site visit that the buildings at Nos 299 – 311 clearly form part of a terrace, albeit a terrace containing buildings of different ages and architectural styles. While Nos 299 and 301 are of the same detailed design and both have a generally unaltered roofscape, they are the only buildings of their type in the terrace. As such, it is difficult to see how a rhythmic front and rear roofslope is established along the terrace.
12. With regard to the SPD's criterion on the number of existing roof extensions and the extent to which unity and consistency has been compromised, it was evident from my site visit that a number of roof extensions have already taken place. These roof extensions include 1 Kember Street at the other end of the terrace of Nos 299 – 311, and other mansard roof extensions at a number of properties within different terraces along this part of Caledonian Road. I have also been referred to appeal decisions² and an approval³ by the Council for roof extensions at nearby properties on Caledonian Road. Given the number of roof extensions within the local context including within the terrace itself, I consider that the unity and consistency of the roofline of this terrace has already been compromised.
13. Turning to the SPD's criterion regarding the length of the terrace, it is a relatively short terrace in the context of Caledonian Road. This part of Caledonian Road has longer terraces on its eastern side, while those terraces on the western side are generally shorter and are separated by side streets. In this particular instance, the proposed development would not fill the gaps between existing roof extensions. As such, it would not reconcile any lost unity.
14. The SPD's final criterion refers to detailed individual consideration of the Conservation Area Design Guidelines in the case of terraces in conservation areas. The Barnsbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines 2002 (Barnsbury CADG) confirms that appropriate roof extensions may be possible on certain properties listed within the document. The appeal property is not within this list. Accordingly, there is conflict with this guidance. The Barnsbury CADG also states that otherwise no roof extensions visible at street level will be permitted. Reference is made to long views from side streets. The Barnsbury CADG highlights that the roofline is a major component of a terrace's character and that alterations to the roofline, party walls and chimney stacks can detrimentally affect an area's character. Notwithstanding the conflict with the Barnsbury CADG, the guidance it provides is not policy. It is apparent that it is necessary to consider the proposed development on its merits and within the local context.
15. The Council has highlighted the need for roof alterations to be invisible from the public realm. Given the proposed development's siting behind the existing frontage and the angles of view, it would not be visible at street level in front of the appeal property. Its rear and side elevation would be likely to be visible from Carnoustie Drive and from Tilloch Street, but this is in keeping with the

² APP/V5570/W/15/3004811 and APP/V5570/W/17/3180678

³ P2014/2723/FUL dated 17 September 2014.

taller element at 1 Kember Street to the north-western corner of the same terrace. Given the existing alterations to the terrace, the height of the building and the angles of view available, this would not be incongruous or unduly prominent.

16. While the proposed development would be visible in longer views from Caledonian Road and surrounding streets and properties, there is already an existing roof extension to this short terrace which can be viewed along Caledonian Road and from its neighbouring streets. As a result, I find that the proposed development's siting, height, bulk and form would be neither dominant nor discordant to either the host building or the terrace.
17. Although the overall design is simple, with appropriate materials proposed for its location, the proposed development would involve the loss of chimney pots and stacks. This is unfortunate. However, they can barely be viewed from the streetscene. As such, I consider that their loss in this instance would not detrimentally affect the area's character.
18. As I have not found any harm, it is not necessary for me to carry out a balancing exercise in terms of paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
19. In conclusion, I find that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area. Accordingly, the proposed development would not conflict with Policies D1, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan, Policies CS6, CS8, and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011, Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Development Management Policies 2013, Islington's Urban Design Guide 2017 and the Framework. These policies and documents collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure developments complement local character and distinctiveness and conserve or enhance the significance of the historic environment. The conflict with the Barnsbury CADG is addressed above.

Conditions

20. The conditions set out above are based on those put forward by the Council. I have amended the wording where relevant in order to comply the Planning Practice Guidance. In the interests of clarity and certainty, it is necessary to impose time limit and plans conditions. The materials condition is required in the interests of the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion

21. For the reasons set out above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the appeal should be allowed.

Joanna Gilbert

INSPECTOR