



Appeal Decision

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

Decision by R C Kirby BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 04 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/21/3276405

34 St Peter's Street, Islington, London, N1 8JT

- 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 & Mrs Centi against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/0144/FUL, dated 15 January 2021, was refused by notice dated 12 March 2021.
 - The development proposed is proposed mansard roof extension.
-

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 Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row CA is characterised by regular terraces of residential properties with valley roofs behind front parapets, displaying architectural cohesiveness. The appeal property, and much of the terrace in which it is situated with shop fronts at ground floor level (Nos 32-42 (even)), are identified as locally listed buildings dating from 1850, being good examples of their period and for their street value. No 34 St Peter's Street is a three storey terrace property. It retains a shop front appearance at the ground floor. The roof is a traditional V shaped, or butterfly roof, which is visible from Danbury Street, with raised parapet walls to the front elevation.
5. The host property and the shop fronted terrace of which it forms part make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA, due in part to the mainly consistent roofline which creates a regular rhythm to the street.
6. The proposed extension would result in a bulky addition within the roofscape of the host dwelling which, whilst set back from the front and rear elevation would be visible in part from the rear, from Danbury Street and from nearby

residential properties from where it would appear as an uncharacteristic addition on this heritage asset, the presence of which would be emphasised by the glazed screen across the valley of the roof and the expanse of glazing that the proposed doors would have.

7. I note that there are examples of roof extensions within the terrace, which have an unknown planning history. However, they do not constitute the predominant roof form within the terrace, which retains uniformity and rhythm characteristic of the CA. The further erosion of the traditional roof form as proposed would significantly reduce the contribution that the host property makes to the significance of the CA as a designated heritage asset.
8. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host and neighbouring dwellings and would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, the proposal 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). Amongst other things, these seek to ensure that development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas and respects the character of the area. There would also be conflict with the design and character aims of the CA Design Guidelines, the Urban Design Guidelines (2017) and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
9. Given that the impact of the proposal relates to only part of the Conservation Area, the harm arising 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 and outdoor space at the property, this is not a public benefit that would outweigh the harm caused to the CA and its significance as a designated heritage asset. Accordingly the proposal conflicts with the conserving and enhancing of the historic environment aims of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposal 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

11. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and agree that the appeal should be dismissed.

RC Kirby

INSPECTOR