



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 July 2024

by C Butcher BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7 August 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/23/3329040

185-187 Caledonian Road, London N1 0SL

- 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 Mr Pieter Brons against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2023/1571/FUL.
 - The development proposed is minor revisions to roof extensions to 185 and 187 Caledonian Road previously approved P2021/3133/FUL & 2021/3134/FUL.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Council adopted the Strategic and Development Management Policies document in September 2023. This replaces the Core Strategy, 2011 and the Development Management Policies, 2013. As such, I have assessed the appeal against the newly adopted suite of policies, the adopted versions of which were provided by the Council. The appellant provided comments on the emerging policies as part of their statement and appears not to have submitted any final comments following the Council's statement which confirmed the adoption of the new local plan. I am therefore satisfied that the interests of natural justice have been maintained.
3. I observed on my site visit that the development appears to have been completed in accordance with the approved plans. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis that retrospective permission is sought for the development which has already been implemented.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Barnsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is located within the Barnsbury Conservation Area, which is a predominantly residential area that covers a significant portion of Islington. From the evidence before me, and from what I saw when I visited the site, the significance of the Conservation Area, in so far as it is relevant to this appeal, is derived from the value of the suburban development of this part of London in the late Georgian and early Victorian periods, and the architectural styles and tastes of the time. It has an aesthetic value due to the appearance of many of

the buildings that comprise the Conservation Area, as well as the abundance of squares and other green spaces.

6. No's 185 and 187 Caledonian Road form part of a terrace of buildings. Their general appearance, including their stock brick exteriors and large sash windows, means that they contribute positively to the significance of the Conservation Area.
7. The principle of providing a mansard roof extension on these buildings was established through a previous grant of planning permission¹. However, based on the plans provided as part of the Council's appeal statement, it is clear that the appearance of these approved roof extensions would have been quite traditional, both in terms of design and materials used. In particular, the alignment of the fenestration would have complemented the appearance of the existing windows on the principal elevations of the two buildings, while the use of natural slates and lead would also have appeared sympathetic.
8. In contrast the scheme before me, which has been implemented, has a much more modern aesthetic with the use of zinc cladding and aluminium window frames. In addition, the two groups of four windows have a horizontal alignment which clashes with the more traditional vertical alignment of the original windows on the floors below. Indeed, the roof extension does not conform with the guidance contained within the Barnsbury Conservation Area Design Guide which encourages the use of traditional materials. In addition, the alignment of the windows within the roof extension conflicts with the guidance contained within the Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document which sets out that the position of dormer windows should take account of the composition of the windows below.
9. As such, the mansard extension results in clear and obvious harm in that it appears as a thoroughly modern addition which clashes strongly with the appearance of the rest of the building as well as others along the terrace. Indeed, while there are other roof extensions in the vicinity, these either follow a traditional style or they cannot be seen from street level. They are therefore not directly comparable to the appeal scheme before me which is easily visible from Caledonian Road.
10. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention is paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. In this instance, due to the limited scale of the development, the harm is relatively localised. However, the appeal site is located at a prominent entry point to the Conservation Area, and so this localised harm is also harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as a whole. The proposal has a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and results in 'less than substantial harm'. In these circumstances, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires that this harm must be weighed against public benefits. Great weight must be given to a designated heritage asset's conservation and any harm to its significance requires clear and convincing justification.
11. In this instance, the development provides additional living space for occupiers. However, this is a private benefit. I therefore conclude that there are no public

¹ Council refs: P2021/3133/FUL & P2021/3134/FUL

benefits that outweigh the less than substantial harm I have identified. The development would therefore fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and would result in harm to its significance. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act and the Framework and would also conflict with Policy HC1 of the London Plan 2021, and Policies PLAN1, DH1 and DH2 of the Strategic and Development Management Policies, September 2023. Taken together, these policies seek to protect designated heritage assets and ensure that development is of a high quality design.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to restorative work undertaken on the building. While this work is to be welcomed, it does not justify allowing a roof extension that has resulted in harm.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development conflicts with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination, that outweigh the identified harm and associated development plan conflict. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Butcher

INSPECTOR