



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 October 2023

by Jameson Bridgwater PGDipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15.11.2023

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/23/3321015

24 St. Paul Street, London, N1 7AB

- 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 Pauline Howcroft and Gordon Anton against the decision of London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2022/4248/FUL, dated 13 December 2022, was refused by notice dated 7 February 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the 'Construction of roof extension, partially within the existing butterfly roof, to the rear of the house'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the construction of roof extension, partially within the existing butterfly roof, to the rear of the house at 24 St. Paul Street, London, N1 7AB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P2022/4248/FUL, dated 13 December 2022, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 689-00a, 689-11e, 689-12f, 689-21b, 689-22i, 689-C1c, 689-C2h, 689-D1a, 689-D2c, 689-F1b, 689-F2b, 689-R1d, 689-J01, 689-J30a, and 689-J31a.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. Since the submission of the appellants' appeal, the Revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published and came into force on the 5 September 2023. The revisions update national policy on planning for onshore wind development in England. As such, the amendments to the Framework are not material in the consideration of the appeal before me.
3. The Islington Local Plan (ILP) was adopted by the Council on the 28 September 2023. In light of this the appellant has been given opportunity to update their representations to consider this change. The Council have confirmed that the ILP replaces all previously saved London Borough of Islington Local Plan policies. I have considered the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, including the Arlington Square Conservation Area, and the host dwelling as a non-designated heritage asset.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a 3 storey, mid Victorian Terrace, with the lowest floor being partially below natural ground level and the roadway. It is not listed but located within the Arlington Square Conservation Area. It has been identified by the Council as a building of local historic and architectural interest. As such, the appeal property is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset.
6. The appeal relates to the erection of a mansard roof extension, including two dormer windows to the front elevation and one dormer window to the rear elevation. The proposed extension would be finished in a natural grey slate with lead coverings and flashings, painted timber sash window and Conservation skylight to the rear. The mansard roof would be set back from the front and rear eaves and would be single storey with a flat roof.
7. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Arlington Square Conservation Area (the CA). In considering the significance of the CA I have had regard to the Arlington Square Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002) (the ASCADG).
8. The CA is predominantly residential and quiet in character with spacious wide roads and a number of green spaces. The southern boundary of the CA borders the Regent's Canal. The ASCADG describes the CA as having special architectural and historic interest due to the strong visual unity of the predominant 2-storey terraces with basements. Properties in the CA generally retain most of their external architectural features such as front boundary railings and traditional iron work. Notwithstanding this, based on my observations it should be noted that a number of the properties within the CA have roof extensions that are broadly similar to the appeal proposal, including some within the same terrace. Although, I accept that these developments are likely to have been carried out under different planning policy regimes.
9. I have carefully considered the Council's representations that the proposed extension would by reason of its design, massing and scale visually impact on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and the CA. However, from my site visit observations I consider that the siting, scale, height, massing, bulk and prominence of the proposed roof extension would not be materially or discernibly different from the extant permission¹ taking into account short, medium and longer views. Furthermore, given that there are already several roof extensions within the host terrace, the proposal would not materially harm the overall architectural integrity of the terrace or the CA when compared to the existing situation. I have also had regard to the fact that the scheme before me does not require the same level of intervention to the original fabric of the host dwelling. It achieves this by retaining the original window opening on the rear elevation and retains the original ceiling height of

¹ P2022/1246/FUL

the room where the staircase will provide access to the roof extension. These are both significant benefits when compared to the extant scheme.

10. Therefore, I conclude that in this site-specific circumstance the proposed roof extension would respect the architectural integrity of the host dwelling and the terrace. Consequently, I find that the proposal would not result in material harm to the dwelling a non-designated heritage asset and would ensure that the character and appearance of the CA is preserved. Consequently, the proposal would not conflict with Policies PLAN1, DH1, and DH2 of the ILP that seek amongst other things to ensure that development is of a high quality that conserves or enhances the significance of the CA.

Conditions

11. The conditions suggested by the Council have been considered in light of the advice contained within the national Planning Practice Guidance and the National Planning Policy Framework. In addition to the standard implementation condition, it is necessary for certainty, to define the plans with which the scheme should accord. To ensure the satisfactory appearance of the scheme it is necessary for the materials used in its construction to match those of the host dwelling.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons and having regard to all other matters I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jameson Bridgwater

INSPECTOR