
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: 14 December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/21/3274849

Flats 8 and 9, 32-34 Danbury Street, Islington, London, N1 8JU

- 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 Jack Barkham and Mr Joshua Jackson against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P/2021/0550/FUL, dated 22 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of roof extension and alterations to existing third floor elevations.
-

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 appeal site is located within the Duncan Terrace/Colebrooke Row CA which is characterised by regular terraces of residential properties with valley roofs behind front parapets, displaying architectural cohesiveness.
5. Nos 32-34 Danbury St are mid terrace 4 storey buildings which have been converted to flats. The roof has previously been extended and has glazed windows extending to most of the width of the terraces. The appeal properties, and the terrace in which they are situated, make a positive contribution to the character of the CA, due in part to their symmetry and mainly consistent roofline which creates a rhythm to the street.
6. Although set back from the front elevation which would reduce the visual impact of the proposal from the street scene, I find that the new extension would be a bulky addition which would detract from the appearance of the host property by significantly altering the roofscape of the building, and its elevational appearance, particularly from the rear, from where it would be

viewed as a prominent addition. Furthermore, the window design of the extension would be at odds with the windows below, further emphasising the incongruous nature of the proposal.

7. Whilst the new extension would be a similar height to the neighbouring roof extension, it would be of a different design, thereby further eroding the otherwise uniform appearance of the terrace. I acknowledge that within Danbury Road, the proposed extension would not be readily apparent at ground level in short range views as it would be set back from the parapet walls. However, it would be visible from the upper floor windows of properties opposite to the front and rear. I noted from my site visit that the proposal would also be visible from longer range public viewpoints on Danbury Street, including at the junction with St Peter's Street. Whilst I accept the development 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 CA.
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 proposed development 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) and policies D1, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), which together seek to ensure that development is of a good design and that the area's character is protected. It would also conflict with the CA Design Guidelines (2002), and the Urban Design Guidelines (2017), which, whilst generally supportive of roof extensions in some instances on the basis that they are correctly detailed, seek to resist such extensions in conservation areas where the existing roof profile contributes to an area's character and where they would be visible from the street, including in long views. The proposal would also be inconsistent with the design and character guidance set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). In addition, it would not meet the statutory tests set out in the Act.
9. 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 and outdoor space at the properties, this is not a public benefit that would outweigh the harm caused to the CA. In addition, the changes to the fenestration and removal of items from the roofscape would not be of sufficient public benefit to overcome the less than substantial harm identified. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with the conserving and enhancing the historic environment objectives of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

10. The proposed 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

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