

Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 21 September 2021 by Hilary Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

Decision by B J Sims BSc CEng MICE MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/21/3275878

3 Chantry Street, Islington, London, N1 8NL

- 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. Marco Santucci against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/0123/FUL, dated 13 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is extension at roof level to provide an additional bedroom and bathroom.
-

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 proposal on the character and appearance of the host and neighbouring dwellings and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row Fields Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal site is located within the Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row Fields Conservation Area. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. The CA is characterised by regular terraces of residential properties with valley roofs behind front parapets.
5. 3 Chantry St is a mid-terrace house in a short row of three dwellings. The roof is a traditional V-shaped, or butterfly roof, with raised parapet walls to the front elevation. This is replicated in the terrace opposite. The appeal property, and the terrace in which it is situated, makes a positive contribution to the character of the CA, due in part to the mainly consistent roofline which creates a rhythm to the street.

6. The proposal is to extend the dwelling at roof level to create an additional bedroom and bathroom and would include roof lights to the front and a mansard to the rear with a dormer window.
7. I note that there are examples of roof extensions in the area, which have an unknown planning history. However, the terrace retains uniformity and rhythm characteristic of the CA, with no alterations to the roof. The addition of the mansard roof and extension would add height and massing to the building, breaching the roof line and creating an addition to the property that would be out of character with its original form. The existing rear elevation of the dwelling has a full-height, bay window feature, which would not be replicated in the proposed extension.
8. I acknowledge that, within Chantry St, the proposed extension would not be readily apparent at ground level, as it would be set back from the parapet walls. However, it would be visible from the upper floor windows of properties opposite. I noted from my site visit that the rear elevation would also be visible from the rear of the surrounding properties. Whilst I accept that the development has been designed to mitigate the impact on the CA and would not be unduly prominent in the public realm, it seems to me that harmful incremental changes such as that proposed would progressively erode the character and appearance of the terrace and its significance in the Conservation Area.
9. For the above reasons, the proposed development would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, the development would not meet the statutory tests set out in the Act and would conflict with policies CS8 and CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy (2011), policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of the Islington Development Management Policies (2013), the CA Design Guidelines, the Urban Design Guidelines (2017) and the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and respects to the character of the area with particular regard to rooflines.
10. Given that the proposal relates to only one part of the Conservation Area, the harm arising from the proposal, in terms of the approach in the Framework, would be less than substantial. In these circumstances the Framework advises at paragraph 202 that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. Whilst I accept that the extension would provide additional living accommodation at the property, this is not a public benefit that would outweigh the harm caused to the CA. There is also no evidence before me to indicate that the appeal property could not be used as a dwelling.

Conclusion and Recommendation

11. The development conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that outweigh this conflict. I therefore recommend that the appeal is dismissed.

Hilary Senior

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

12. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

B J Sims

INSPECTOR