



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 July 2024

by Claire Searson MSc PGDip BSc (Hons) MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 August 2024

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/24/3341949

114 Liverpool Road, LONDON N1 0RE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mark & Alexandra Eldridge against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
- The application ref is P2023/3340/FUL.
- The development proposed is the replacement of the existing roof with roof extension.

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/Y/24/3341955

114 Liverpool Road, LONDON N1 0RE

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mark & Alexandra Eldridge against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application ref is P2023/3355/LBC.
 - The works proposed are the replacement of the existing roof with roof extension.
-

Decision – Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Decision – Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

Main Issue

4. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposed development and works on the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

5. The appeal property forms part of a Grade II listed terrace at Nos 82-124 which dates from 1829-1834. Designed by architects Francis Edwards and developed by W.S. Dove, the terrace is set out in a symmetrical design with pedimented centrepiece and wings. Properties are buff brick construction with painted stucco to ground and basement floor levels. The terrace is two-bays wide and four-storeys in height with butterfly roofs set behind a raised parapet

to the front. The significance and special interest of the listed building is based, in part as a typical London Georgian terrace, designed as a whole architectural unit, of which the appeal property, being mid-terrace, forms an integral part.

6. The Barnsbury CA is a predominantly residential in character with a number of fine Georgian and Victorian terraces properties and Squares, including Gibson Square, located to the rear of the appeal property. The Barnsbury CA Guidelines (2002) note that the CA includes some of the finest sequences of squares and terraces in London and that the area has a rare quality of consistency and completeness. Liverpool Street contains a number of terraces, including opposite the appeal property which is in a similar design, but in an elevated position. The appeal property and terrace contributes positively to the character and appearance of the CA.
7. Consent is sought for the replacement of the butterfly roof with a mansard roof in order to create two additional bedrooms and a shower room. To the front, behind the parapet, it would be angled sheet lead, then a partial flat roof section with rooflights, and then a natural slate finish to the rear angled portion. The existing butterfly brick profile would remain in situ as a parapet, but effectively the roof would be infilled between the chimney stacks.
8. While a degree of care has gone into the design in terms of its height and massing, the result would be an incongruous upwards appendage which would have a particularly unusual profile in the form proposed. This would be significantly at odds with the traditional roofscape.
9. The terrace has had later alterations made to it, for example through the replacement of sash windows in different designs. To the rear, more of the symmetry has been lost through alterations and extensions. Specifically, a number of properties in the terrace have had roof extensions, which include the squaring off of part of the butterfly roof design. However, while it is argued that these examples have set a precedent, instead those examples serve to confirm the harm to the roof and the loss of symmetry to the rear roofs of the terraced row.
10. Efforts have been made in terms of limiting the visibility of the roof extension from the front, however when observing from Liverpool Street as existing, a clear view between the existing chimney stacks is apparent and I consider that it is highly likely that the proposed roof extension would be seen. The modelled views as submitted are not verified and do not appear to fully replicate the submitted plans. The proposals would also be visible from the rear, albeit in private views by owners of the terraced dwellings to Liverpool Street and the rear of Gibson Square and in my view this would be harmful to the character and appearance of the CA.
11. Moreover, the visual effects are only one consideration when assessing proposals for a listed building and the loss of the historic fabric from the roof structure would also cause harm to the listed building.
12. The harm to these heritage assets can be quantified as less than substantial harm, and while I note the public benefits put forward by the appellant, they would not be sufficient to outweigh this. In particular, I note the existing roof structure is in poor condition and the roof is currently leaking. However, there is nothing before me to suggest why the property could not be maintained in

its existing form. This would also realise benefits in terms of the preservation of traditional building skills.

13. Similarly, in terms of purported insulation and carbon reduction measures from the replacement of the existing heating system to a more efficient one, again, it is not clear why the proposed works are necessary to facilitate these measures. The contribution of a larger property to meet Islington's housing requirements is unsubstantiated.
14. Overall, taking into account the particular circumstances and having carefully considered all the evidence, I therefore conclude that the works would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building and CA. This would be in conflict with policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) which seek to secure good design and conserve the significance of heritage assets. The proposals would also conflict with policies Plan1, DH1 and DH2 of the Islington Local Plan (2023) which seeks to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, and promote good design which would not undermine the quality of existing development and streetscape.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons above, taking into account all other matters raised, I dismiss both of the appeals.

C Searson

INSPECTOR