



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 November 2021

by Mr M Brooker DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 January 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/21/3282359

32 Arlington Avenue, London N1 7AY

- 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 and Ms Matthew and Kelly Pointon and Kowal against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/1058/FUL, dated 7 April 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2021.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of a mansard extension at roof level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area, including the Conservation area, and the locally listed appeal property.

Reasons

3. The site is located within the Arlington Square Conservation Area (ASCA), Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.
4. I saw at the site visit that the ASCA derives significance as a heritage asset from the architectural and historic quality of some of the buildings in the area. Of particular importance are the wide boulevard style streets and a strong visual effect of early-mid 19th century terraced houses whose repetitive nature give the streets a distinctive identity.
5. The Council's report details various dimensions of the proposed roof extension and measurements in respect of its relationship with the existing building and concern is raised that the insertion of the proposed roof extension would result in the loss of "the largely unbroken roofline".
6. I saw at the site visit that there are examples within the local area of other roof extensions, many that are not dissimilar to that proposed here. On Arlington Avenue I saw that there are some roof extensions and alterations, without a prevailing design. However, there are no notable roof alterations on the short section of terraced properties that includes the appeal property and terminates at the 38 Arlington Avenue, which forms a bridge over the access to Clock Tower Mews., with the exception of the small roof extension on that property

and is differentiated from the remainder of the small terrace by its unique design.

7. It is not at dispute between the parties that the appeal scheme will not be visible from the street to the front of the appeal property and based on my observations on site I agree. To the rear, the appeal scheme would be subject of some limited views from Clock Tower Mews and private gardens.
8. Guidance set out in Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) clearly recognises the importance of roofs within a Conservation Area and states "proposals for roof extensions anywhere along an unaltered rooflines within a conservation area will not generally be acceptable".
9. As such, the appeal scheme would introduce an extension shown on the submitted plans of being of significant bulk into an otherwise unaltered roofline, thus resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the Conservation area, and the locally listed appeal property, contrary to the detailed guidance set out in the SPD.
10. In relation to the test concerning the level of harm as it applies to designated heritage assets under the National Planning Policy Framework, based on the reasons I have set out above, 'less than substantial' harm to the significance of the conservation area would arise. There are no public benefits that have been put to me that would outweigh this harm.
11. As such, the appeal scheme is contrary to Policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan; Policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy; Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Development Management Policies; and the guidance contained within the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document that amongst other matters seek to maintain the design quality of new development, protecting the heritage and character of the area including Conservation Areas.

Other Matters

12. The appellant details that Clock Tower Mews is a private road and I saw a small sign confirming this at the site visit. Nonetheless the appeal scheme would be visible from private and what might be described as communal spaces, if not public spaces. It is my planning judgement that this does not sufficiently mitigate the harm that would result from the appeal scheme, such that the appeal scheme would be acceptable.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Mr M Brooker

INSPECTOR