



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 December 2024

by **C Skelly BA (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/24/3351297

17 Wharfdale Road, London N1 9SB

- 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 Simon Rowe of Studio Rowe LLP against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2024/0467/FUL.
 - The development proposed is demolition of 1.5 storey rear WC block, to be replaced by 2.5 storey WC/shower block. Glazed rear garden extension at basement level. Partial excavation of basement and garden slabs, with underpinning to increase internal floor-to-ceiling heights by approximately 450mm. Mansard roof conversion to create additional room at third floor level, with photovoltaics above and raised chimneys. Conversion includes conservation roof lights to the street, and dormer windows to the rear. The set-back of the proposed conversion conceals it from the street. Exterior refurbishment and repair, to include timber sash windows with new heritage slimline double glazing, improved wall insulation, sustainable heat exchange systems. Full interior refurbishment, to modify the property from three flats to a single family residence. Works include modifications to internal layouts and new staircases throughout.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 12 December 2024. I have sought comments from both parties in this regard and this has informed my decision.
3. Because the appeal site lies in the Keystone Crescent Conservation Area (CA), I have had special regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCAA).

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character of the CA in which the site is located.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a three-storey terrace property, with basement. Although the property was previously a HMO, I observed that the inside of the building has been stripped out. To the rear of the property is an existing 1.5 storey flat roof extension and steps down to the small rear garden area. The property is identified in the Register of Locally Listed Buildings (April 2010) as a Grade A Locally Listed Building. This document refers to Nos 1-17 rather than individual properties citing

their special features as including original glazing bars and decorative cast iron front railings.

6. The CA covers an area of housing developed along the new link road (Caledonian Road) which runs between the New Road and the Holloway area. The boundary runs along the centre of Wharfdale Road. Its significance is derived from the remaining coherent appearance of the area which has largely remained unchanged since it was laid out. Given the above, I find that the significance of the CA, in so far as it relates to this appeal is primarily associated with the consistent appearance of the traditional terrace. The host property retains its traditional appearance and therefore makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA.
7. Paragraph 125e) of the Framework provides support for upward extensions, including mansard roofs where the development would be consistent with the prevailing form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers.
8. The Keystone Crescent (CA14) Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002) (CADG) lists locations where new roof extensions visible from street levels or public areas will be allowed. It goes on to state that elsewhere, which includes the appeal site, such proposals will not be permitted because the roofline of a street, particularly on a terrace is a major component of its character. Alterations which are not in keeping with the existing roofs have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the CA.
9. The appeal site is part of a traditional terrace which has a consistent appearance, a key feature of which is the uninterrupted roofline. Although the proposed mansard would be set back from the parapet walls and would retain the rear butterfly roof, its increased height would visually break up the uninterrupted roofline of the terrace.
10. The site adjoins the taller building of 19 Wharfdale Road, which wraps around the corner with Northdown Street. This building has a mansard roof but has clearly been designed to have a different appearance to the terrace reflecting its prominent corner position. The proposed upward extension through the mansard and change to the chimney would alter its relationship to the corner building, competing with its scale. This would contrast with the consistent pattern of the wider terrace and its roofscape, undermining the planned historic layout of the area.
11. Notwithstanding that the proposed mansard would not be prominent from the street in front of the appeal site, it would be visible from longer distance views along New Wharf Road, further along Wharfdale Road and from higher windows of neighbouring properties. When viewed from these vantage points the proposed mansard would appear as a stand-alone addition, which would disrupt the consistent appearance of the terrace's roofline. Given that the property makes a positive contribution to the significance of the CA and that it would cause harm to the appearance of the roofscape, the proposed mansard would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
12. The appellant has referred me to the previous permission granted at No. 15 which included a mansard roof extension. However, there is no evidence before me to

indicate that the permission is extant and therefore, I attribute this little weight. I have also been referred to examples of mansard roofs at 54-58 and 62-66 Northdown Street and 31 and 33 Wharfdale Road. These examples are in separate terraces which do not have unbroken, consistent rooflines and therefore they are not directly comparable with the appeal case. In any event each case must be considered on its own merits, which I have done. The appellant has also referred me to 97 Caledonian Road which is a corner building, similar to 19 Wharfdale Road, which has been designed to be more prominent and different to the terrace which it adjoins. Therefore, these examples do not lead me to reach a different conclusion on the main issue.

13. The CADG states that half width rear extensions higher than two storeys will not normally be permitted unless it can be shown that no harm will be caused to the character of the area. The existing extensions to the rear of the terrace are limited to the ground floor level and therefore the consistent appearance of the terrace is retained above this height. Although the rear of the building at ground floor level is visually contained from wider views, the proposed extension would still be visible from the rear gardens of neighbouring properties. The proposed extension would partially overhang at the lower ground floor level and therefore its overall bulk would be reduced. Nevertheless, its height at 2.5 storeys would appear as a prominent addition which would erode the uniform appearance to the rear of the terrace. Therefore, the proposed extension would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the CA.
14. I note that the appellant has suggested that they would be willing to agree to a materials condition, however this would not address concerns raised in relation to its height and effect on the appearance of the rear of the terrace.

Heritage Balance and Conclusion

15. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the host building, a NDHA, which contributes positively to the CA. I find the harm to be less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where harm is identified to the significance of designated heritage assets and their setting, it should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
16. The proposed development would create additional living space for the appellant, however this is a private benefit. It would also include the provision of photovoltaics and an air source heat pump, which would have some limited public benefits. However, these benefits are not sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the CA. Given this and the above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to satisfy the requirements of the LBCAA, paragraph 210 of the Framework, and conflicts with Policies PLAN1, DH1 and DH2 of the Islington Strategic and Development Management Policies (2023), which seek amongst other things to ensure new developments are of high quality design, which makes a positive contribution to local character, conserves and enhances heritage assets.
17. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

C Skelly
INSPECTOR