



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 February 2022

by Katherine Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 March 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/21/3284809

193 Caledonian Road, Islington, London N1 0SL

- 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 Tasos Aresti against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2021/0571/FUL, dated 24 February 2021, was refused by notice dated 19 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension to provide additional bedroom and storage accommodation for Flat 3.
-

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 host property, terrace and the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a terraced property on the junction of Caledonian Road and Copenhagen Street and has been converted into flats. The building is part of a short terrace of flat roofed 3-storey properties with basements which face onto Copenhagen Street within the Conservation Area (CA). The corner building which forms part of the appeal property is a taller more ornate building with a truncated pitched roof and fronts onto Caledonian Road.
4. The proposed mansard roof extension would sit on the existing flat roof and would provide additional living accommodation for the upper flat. The area is of a mixed commercial and residential character. The simple form of the terrace in which the proposal is located makes positive contribution to the CA.
5. The Islington Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (2017) (SPD) provides general advice on roof extensions. It confirms that it is necessary to consider the particular terrace within which the host building sits. Within conservation areas, the SPD asserts that the roofline is often important in contributing to an area's character and therefore proposals for roof extensions
6. I saw from my site visit that the proposal would be visible from Copenhagen Street and to a lesser extent from Caledonian Road and other adjacent streets, where it would be partially obscured from longer range views by other buildings. I also saw that the adjacent property at 149 Copenhagen Street has a roof terrace with railings and bamboo screening which would also obscure views of the proposal. There are, however, no other notable roof alterations to

this section of terrace. Therefore, although the proposal would only be visible within the locality of the terrace, it would break the strong sense of uniformity of the flat roofs of it. Consequently, it would adversely affect its appearance. I acknowledge that the proposal would be no higher than the adjacent building. However, this is read as part of the terrace of large properties facing Caledonian Road rather than the terrace facing Copenhagen Street where the proposal would be located.

7. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 places a statutory duty to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In considering the effect of the proposal on the CA the impact must be weighed against the harm it would have on the heritage asset.
8. The significance of the CA is largely derived from its late Georgian and early Victorian architecture. The Conservation Area Design Guidelines 2002(CADG) advises that the roofline of a street, particularly on a terrace, is a major component of its character. Alterations which are not in keeping with the existing buildings have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the CA.
9. Individual terraces make an important contribution to the significance of the CA. The proposal would introduce a mansard extension on this terrace where there is an absence of such types of extension and as such it would be an incongruous feature in the roofscape. Consequently, it would be harmful to the CA. The harm to the CA as a whole, however, would be less than substantial.
10. Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that where the harm is less than substantial, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Additional living accommodation that would be provided by the proposal would benefit the occupiers of the building and therefore would be private in nature. Although the replacement of windows in the front elevation of the property offers a public benefit, in terms of improving the appearance of the building and the CA, due to the small scale of the proposal, this is ascribed only limited weight which would not outweigh the harm that I have found.
11. I therefore find that the proposal would have an unacceptably harmful impact on the character and appearance of the appeal property, the terrace and fails to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. As such it would be contrary to Islington Local Plan policies CS8 and CS9 and the London Plan policies D1, D4 and HC1 which seek to ensure that development is of a high quality and conserves or enhances heritage assets. It also fails to comply with the Council's Development Management Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 as well as the SPD.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Katherine Robbie

INSPECTOR