
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 25 January 2022

by Oliver Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 4TH March 2022.

Appeal A: APP/V5570/3288421

12 Barnsbury Terrace, Islington, London, N1 1JH

- 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 Simon Silverston (Tasou Associates) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/2024/FUL, dated 9 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 15 September 2021.
 - The development proposed is demolition of a single storey side garage extension and the erection of a double storey side extension alongside with amendments to the front and rear gardens.
-

Appeal B: APP/V5570/3291016

12 Barnsbury Terrace, Islington, London, N1 1JH

- 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 Simon Silverston against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/3451/FUL, dated 23 November 2021, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of a single storey side garage extension and the erection of a double storey side extension alongside with amendments to the front and rear gardens.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. They differ in respect of the extension's front elevation and in a proposed bin store for Appeal A. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in both appeals is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

The character and appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area

5. The Barnsbury Conservation Area (CA) contains many examples of formal, late Georgian and early Victorian residential developments, including fine sequences of squares and terraces. Barnsbury Terrace is on a back lane and has a variety of buildings from different eras. This gives it less uniformity and consistency than other parts of the CA. Nevertheless, number 12 Barnsbury Terrace, a four-storey semi-detached house, is an imposing and elegant building which makes a positive contribution to the CA.
6. For both Appeals A and B, the proposed side extension would replace an existing garage, now in alternative use. It would be taller and wider than the existing extension but slightly more recessed and with the increase in width hidden behind the proposed bin store in Appeal A and a wall in Appeal B.
7. The Barnsbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines ('the Guidelines') advise that side extensions to semi-detached properties will not be permitted, to avoid blocking glimpses of green open spaces beyond. In this case the street has few gaps and number 12 already has an extension to the side. The proposal though taller would block little of interest and I see no objection in principle to a side extension.
8. Islington's Urban Design Guide ('the UDG') states that side extensions should take into account the rhythm and symmetry of the built form and the street as a whole. In this case however the symmetry with number 13 that may once have existed has already been diminished because of that property's side extension. Although constructed of brick to match the original house, the proposal would not improve the balance of the two properties.
9. The side extension would be particularly visible along Barnsbury Terrace looking towards The Courtyard. It would exceed the building line of the adjacent row of terraced properties, but so too does the existing extension. When viewed from the side, its depth would be partially screened by the terrace and by the proposed boundary wall, with the remainder being viewed against the backdrop of the appeal property's flank wall.
10. However, the additional height and scale of the extension in both appeals would be much less subordinate to its host than the existing diminutive former garage. When viewed front-on from the road, both proposals would give the appearance of straddling the upper and lower ground floor storeys. As a result, in each case its additional massing would not reflect the existing house's storey heights.
11. This effect is accentuated by the proposed design. In Appeal A the vertical emphasis of the plate glass window would not reflect the proportions of the existing property. While the same window in Appeal B would have a higher sill height to match that of the house's main ground floor window, the elevation's design means that its vertical emphasis and massing remains. In both cases the extension would appear incongruous and harmful.
12. Turning to the proposed bin store, in Appeal A this consists of a timber enclosure with doors together with planting to the front. The existing bins are already screened by the boundary wall when viewed along the Terrace towards The Courtyard, limiting their harmful effect. While the proposed bin store would

be screened from the side by the proposed taller side wall, when viewed from the front it would appear as a large bulky addition, harming the CA's character and appearance.

13. In Appeal B, the bin store is replaced by an attached wall and railings fronting the highway. Although also visible from the road, notwithstanding the advice in the Guidelines and the UDG, this arrangement would have an unobtrusive, neutral effect on the CA.
14. In respect of Appeal A, the appellants have invited me to consider whether the extension can be considered separately from the bin store should I find the latter unacceptable, but in light of my findings above this would not overcome my concerns.

Conclusion

15. The statutory duty in Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 is a matter of considerable importance and weight. Although I have found that the bin storage element of Appeal B would have a neutral effect on the CA, I conclude overall that both Appeal A and Appeal B would harm the character and appearance of the Barnsbury CA as a whole.
16. For both cases such harm would be less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, I am required by the Framework to give great weight to such harm. The benefits of the proposal would be largely private and would not outweigh the harm.
17. As such, they would fail to comply with adopted development plan policies CS8 and CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy (February 2011), policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of the Islington Local Plan Development Management Policies (June 2013); and policies D1, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (March 2021). When read together, these policies state that development must have a high-quality design, that conserves and enhances heritage assets. For similar reasons the proposals would also conflict with the Framework.
18. I therefore conclude that having regard to the development plan and all other material considerations, I dismiss both Appeal A and Appeal B.

Oliver Marigold

INSPECTOR