



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2021

by C Rafferty LLB (Hons), Solicitor

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/21/3269546

11 Lambert Street, Islington, London N1 1JE

- 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 Alexandre Beauvais against the decision of Islington Borough Council.
 - The application Ref P2020/3134/FUL, dated 11 November 2020, was refused by notice dated 15 January 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as 'dormer window to main house roof in place of two velux windows'.
-

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 Issues

3. The main issues are the impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The site is in the Barnsbury Conservation Area (CA), which derives special interest from the sequences of late Georgian/early Victorian residential developments. In particular, the rooflines of terraced streets are noted as a major component of the CA's character. The site comprises a traditional style locally listed dwelling in a terraced row with roofscapes void of dormer elements. Overall, it makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
5. The SPD¹ states that roof extensions along an unaltered roofline in a conservation area will not generally be acceptable. It also acknowledges that such proposals would be subject to Design Guidelines² which state that, apart from certain noted properties, roof extensions visible from any street level

¹ Islington Urban Design Guidance Supplementary Planning Document January 2017

² Islington's Conservation Area Design Guidelines January 2002

position will not be permitted. While these documents are guidance rather than policy, they remain material considerations.

6. The host dwelling is not noted as a property where a roof extension would be permitted and despite the presence of rooflights, its roofline can be described as largely unaltered due to the lack of extension elements or dormers. The dormer would introduce ample additional bulk to the property, causing a significant alteration to its roofline. It would result in an uncharacteristic top heavy appearance, upsetting the current form of the dwelling and, as a result, eroding its positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
7. With regards to the wider area, visibility of the dormer would be limited, and the proposal would not impact the front roofline. Nonetheless, the viewpoint from Thornhill Grove would provide a clear vantage point of the proposal from street level within the CA. From here, despite the varied rear elevations, the unity and consistency of the current unbroken roofline, reminiscent of the terrace's original era, is clear. This is an important characteristic that the dormer would upset, such that despite its modest scale, set in and traditional design it would appear out of place, failing to respect the form of the dwelling and its surrounding context.
8. Although other rear dormers are visible from the site, I have no information on the circumstances under which they were granted permission. In any event, views of the proposed dormer would be experienced primarily in the context of its terraced row, where such development is not characteristic.
9. The proposal would also replace the current rooflights at the property. While these are not in keeping with the traditional style of the dwelling in their own right, they are notably more discreet than the combination of the proposed dormer and larger rooflight. In addition, the current windows are similar in scale and positioning to other rooflights on this row of terraces such that replacing them with the proposal would cause a more notable distinction, further eroding the level of consistency along the roofscapes.
10. As a result of the proposal the traditional appearance of the dwelling would not be respected. The additional bulk to the roofscape would be out of place and would neither preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, the proposal would cause visual harm to the CA and its significance as a designated heritage asset. However, the proposal would only be visible from a limited section of the CA. As such, this would equate to 'less than substantial' harm to the CA, having regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nonetheless the Framework makes it clear that great weight should be given to the conservation of heritage assets.
11. Where such harm would be caused paragraph 196 of the Framework specifies that such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. No such benefits have been presented by the appellant.
12. For all of these reasons I find that the proposal would have a significantly adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Accordingly, it would fail to comply with Policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy 2011, Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies June 2013, the SPD and the Design

Guidelines which together seek to promote good design and preserve the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion and Recommendation

13. Having had regard to all matters raised, I find that there are no material considerations that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan. For the reasons given above, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Rafferty

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

14. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report, and, on that basis, I agree with the recommendation and shall dismiss the appeal.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR