



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 November 2022

by J Hills MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th December 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/22/3302141

2 Mary Street, Islington, London N1 7DL

- 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 Vincent Maugendre against the decision of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2022/1463/FUL, dated 19 April 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2022.
 - The development is described in the application as "loft conversion + terrace on front, Ally sliding doors and glass balustrade to rear".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. I have taken the description of development from the decision notice. Although different to the application form it more accurately describes the scheme by making reference to the extension and was also used on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Arlington Square Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. Whilst not identical in its appearance to other properties in its terrace, the appeal site comprises a locally listed property within the CA. The significance of the CA includes the strong visual unity of its 1840's terraces of mainly two storeys, where their close proximity to the canal contributes towards the character of industrial vernacular found within the CA. Generally, the houses retain most of their external architectural details, which includes butterfly parapet roof profiles. Roof extensions are mostly limited to terraces where a significant number have already been introduced, and where a harmonious roofline has been or is close to being formed. These streets tend to be wide, giving the area a pleasantly spacious feeling. The host property is part of a mid C19 terrace that has a rhythmic and undisturbed roofscape.
5. There is a statutory duty to pay special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area; and great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The proposed tile cladding and frontage fenestration that matches the existing fittings would be acceptable. Like similar developments in the surrounding streets, the butterfly parapet profile of the rear roofline would remain visible as a result of the proposed development.

However, the full-width extension would rise vertically over this characterful pitch, introducing significant additional bulk and massing above the host property. Furthermore, the proposed glazing to the rear would be extensive and not of a scale or design that reflects the existing architecture, which collectively would fail to preserve the building's architectural character and qualities.

6. Views of the rear element of the proposal would be limited to those from within the private realm. Views towards the proposed extension from the street immediately below would be limited due to the proximity of the nearby public house, its set back from the parapet, and low ceiling height. However, it was clear from my visit that the forward projections would nevertheless be visible from various public vantage points due to the wide surrounding streets and low building heights. This would result in an uncharacteristic and harmful addition of built form above the unbroken roofline of this terrace, which is an example of original architectural detail and a particular quality of this part of the CA.
7. The appellant has referred to examples of roof extensions within the wider CA at Bevan Street, St Paul Street, Linton Street, Rydon Street, Rees Street and Arlington Avenue. These examples are not within the same terrace as the appeal site which has its own particular, undisturbed character. Additionally, they either sit within a terrace where a large number of roof extensions have already disturbed that roofscape or would not be seen or read within the context of the appeal site. Consequently, these examples are materially different to the scheme before me.
8. The proposal would cause less than substantial harm to the CA. Having regard to the harm identified as being less than substantial, it is necessary to consider any public benefits of the proposed development. Although there may be very limited public benefits where a larger family home may allow the appellant to continue to reside in the area, these would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm.
9. Therefore, I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Policies D1, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies CS8 and CS9 of the Islington Core Strategy (2011), Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of the Development Management Policies (2013), the guidance contained within the Urban Design Guide (2017) and the Arlington Square Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002). These policies, together in respect of this issue, seek to promote good design and to conserve and enhance the unique character of the built and historic environment. The proposal would also conflict with section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment.

Other Matters

10. A good level of amenity would be provided by the development, though any such benefits would not outweigh the harm I have identified. Even if there were no objections from neighbouring occupiers, this is not a reason in itself to make the scheme acceptable.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons above, and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to accord with the development plan as a whole and there are no considerations individually or cumulatively that outweigh this. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

J Hills

INSPECTOR