



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2023

by F Wilkinson BSc (Hons), MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25th October 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/23/3317089

Flat B, 316 Caledonian Road, Islington, London N1 1BB

- 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 Mario Guzel of Guzel Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2022/2871/FUL, dated 1 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is remove valley roof and add mansard with front and rear dormers.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council's assessment of the proposal refers to the 2011 adopted Islington's Core Strategy and the 2013 adopted Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies. These have been superseded by the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies, adopted in September 2023 (the LP). The main parties have been given the opportunity to comment on the adoption of the LP. I have taken the LP and any comments made thereon into account in my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, terrace and the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The significance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area (the CA) is in part derived from its late Georgian and early Victorian architecture. In addition to fine sequences of squares and residential terraces, the CA contains shopping frontages along Caledonian Road and Liverpool Road which are an important contribution to the character of the area. Rooflines of streets, particularly for terraces, form a major component of the character and appearance of the CA, with the 2002 Barnsbury Conservation Area Design Guidelines (the Design Guidelines) confirming that the most common roof form is the hidden valley roof behind a parapet wall.
5. The appeal property is part of a terrace fronting onto Caledonian Road with commercial use at ground floor and residential on the upper two floors and has a valley roof behind a parapet. It is therefore typical of the architecture here and contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.

6. The 2017 Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (the SPD) provides advice on roof extensions. The SPD states that it is necessary to consider the particular terrace within which the host building sits and the local context. Within conservation areas, the SPD advises that the roofline is often important in contributing to an area's character and therefore proposals for roof extensions anywhere along an unaltered roofline within a conservation area will not generally be acceptable. The SPD sets out criteria for roof extensions in conservation areas, where the roofline is broken.
7. The first criterion relates to the number of existing roof extensions and the extent to which unity and consistency has been compromised. Many of the roofs along the long terrace of buildings in which the appeal property is located are valley roofs behind front parapet walls. Extending in both directions from the appeal property, there is a run of properties with unbroken valley roofs. A number of the buildings have been extended through mansard roofs, but these are predominantly located within the southern part of the terrace. There appears to be no mansard roofs to the north of the appeal property on this terrace, and there is a notable gap between the appeal property and the nearest existing mansard roof extension. In light of the expanse of existing roofs without roof extensions, the proposal would compromise the unity and consistency of the roofline.
8. The second criterion relates to the length of the terrace in the context of opportunity for reconciling unity. The appeal property is part of a long terrace in the context of Caledonian Road. The proposal would not reconcile any previous loss of unity or consistency through filling gaps between existing roof extensions.
9. The SPD's final criterion refers to detailed individual consideration of the conservation area design guidelines. The Design Guidelines confirms that appropriate roof extensions may be possible on certain identified buildings. The appeal property is not one of these. Accordingly, there would be conflict with this guidance. The Design Guidelines also states that otherwise no roof extension visible from any street level position will be permitted, including long views from side streets and across open spaces.
10. Notwithstanding the conflict with the Design Guidelines, the guidance it provides is not policy. It is necessary to consider the proposal on its merits and within its local context.
11. The mansard roof extension would be traditional in its design. It would have windows to the front and rear and would be set back from the front parapet. The appellant has submitted a plan¹ which shows that it would not be visible at street level opposite the site. However, this does not take account of views from other points along Caledonian Road where the angle of view would be different. Furthermore, the proposed development would be at least partially visible from Story Street and a stretch of Carnoustie Drive as well as in views from the upper floors of neighbouring properties opposite and to the rear.
12. The appellant has drawn attention to a number of mansard roofs in the vicinity along Caledonian Road at nos. 272, 280, 284, 294-296. These mansard roofs lie in the southern part of the terrace as noted above. The appellant has also identified that permission was granted for a similar mansard roof at no. 350 as

¹ proposed long section

is proposed here. In that case, the officer report identifies that the property is part of a terrace which contains several roof additions and refers to the existence of much larger additions to the north and south of the property. The context for that proposal is not therefore directly analogous to the appeal property. In any event, I have evaluated the appeal proposal on its individual planning merits.

13. Given the location of the appeal property within a generally unaltered part of the long terrace and the angles of view available, the proposal would be discordant and would harm the rhythm of the existing roofscape. As a result, I conclude that the proposal's siting, height, and form would be harmful to the host building, the terrace, and the CA. As such the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023 (the Framework) I assess the harm to the CA as less than substantial.
14. While appreciating the desire to create a larger space, and therefore an improved living environment for occupiers, this would not amount to a public benefit. Consequently, there would not be clear and convincing justification for harm to or loss of significance of the designated heritage asset, as required by paragraph 200 of the Framework, nor would the great weight that should be given to the heritage asset's conservation be outweighed.
15. For the reasons outlined above, the proposal would conflict with Policy HC1 of the 2021 London Plan and Policies DH1, DH2 and PLAN1 of the LP. Amongst other matters, these require proposals to conserve or enhance the significance of heritage assets, and make a positive contribution to local character, legibility, and distinctiveness. There would also be conflict with paragraph 197 of the Framework which requires account to be taken of the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness, as well as the guidance in the SPD and Design Guidelines as summarised above.
16. The Council's appeal statement refers to Policies S1 and S2 of the LP. These set out criteria for delivering sustainable design and sustainable design and construction. However, these do not include criteria specific to the character and appearance of an area or heritage assets, which is the focus of the Council's reason for refusal. I have no specific reasons in the evidence before me to conclude that the proposal would conflict with these policies. However, this does not alter my overall conclusion on the proposal.

Conclusion

17. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole as well as the Framework. There are no material considerations of sufficient weight that would indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, for the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

F Wilkinson

INSPECTOR