



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 17 June 2025

by **A Parkin BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th July 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3359288

13A Cloudesley Street, Islington, London N1 0HU

- 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 Mrs Melissa Hetherington against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2024/0536/FUL.
The development proposed is modifications to internal layout and external existing openings
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/Y/25/3359287

13A Cloudesley Street, Islington, London N1 0HU

- 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 Mrs Melissa Hetherington against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2024/0562/LBC.
 - The works proposed are modifications to internal layout and external existing openings.
-

Appeal A: Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B: Decision

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. As set out above there are two appeals on this site. Appeal A concerns an application for planning permission for external works, whilst Appeal B concerns an application for listed building consent for these works and internal alterations to the building. In both cases the description of the proposal is the same. I have considered each on its individual merits and with regard to relevant legislation, policy and guidance. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. As the proposal is in a conservation area, and relates to a listed building, I have had regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
5. On its decision notices the Council lists the drawings and documents considered in determining the applications. However, different revisions of the same drawings are listed. I have, therefore, considered the latest version of any such drawings in

determining this appeal. I have also made minor changes to the description of the proposal in the banner heading above, to remove superfluous words.

Main Issues

6. The main issues for Appeal A and Appeal B are the effect of the proposal on the significance of designated heritage assets.

Reasons

7. 13A Cloudesley Street is a basement flat in a Grade II listed building, forming part of a terrace on the western side of the street, constructed in the early to mid-19th century¹.
8. The design of the terrace incorporates pairs of buildings, which are joined together where the principal entrances are positioned. The entrance bays are two storeys in height and are set back from the main buildings, which also include slate mansard roofs and basements. The buildings are constructed from yellow stock bricks with a white, scored stucco at ground and basement level. The basement areas are served by lightwells at the front and rear.
9. Insofar as it relates to these appeals, the significance of this listed building stems from its historical development and function, including the internal layout at basement level.
10. The terrace containing the appeal building is located within the Barnsbury Conservation Area (the BCA), which has a predominantly residential character and contains fine examples of late Georgian and early Victorian buildings, within maturely landscaped streets and squares.
11. Insofar as it relates to these appeals, the significance of the BCA stems from the historical development of the area, and the architectural and historical interest of the buildings to be found there.
12. The building was converted into flats at the turn of the millennium, which entailed the creation of a separate entrance to the newly created basement flat. The entrance is via external metal steps into a typical front lightwell, set back from Cloudesley Street in a small garden.
13. The conversion of the listed building into flats has diminished its significance to some extent, including the loss of elements of the historic fabric of the building, changes to the internal layout and rooms, and to internal circulation routes. The appellant has provided a drawing showing what they consider would have been the original basement layout of the building, alongside the currently existing layout, and the layout proposed.
14. The proposal would entail the insertion of a large opening² in the internal wall between the kitchen and the lounge, which would result in the loss of parts of the original fabric of the building. There have already been changes to this wall including the current doorway opening between the two rooms; there are also further internal partitions between the kitchen and bathroom. However, at the present time it is still possible to appreciate elements of the original layout and circulation routes.

¹ 7-16 Cloudesley Street - List Entry Number: 1293285

² Structural opening of some 3220mm and finished opening of some 2770mm

15. Whilst wall nibs would be retained, the width of the proposed opening would significantly alter how the basement would be perceived. Instead of two distinct rooms, the perception would be of a much more open-plan kitchen / lounge space, with very little of the original layout and circulation routes recognisable. This would detract from the architectural and historic interest of the listed building and would cause less than substantial harm to its significance. Whilst this harm would be towards the lower end of the scale, any harm to a designated heritage asset attracts considerable weight³.
16. Furthermore, despite the previous alterations, No 13A makes a positive contribution to the significance of the BCA. Consequently, the harm that would be caused to the significance of the listed building by the proposal would also detract from the significance of the BCA causing less than substantial harm. Whilst this would be towards the lowest end of the scale, again, any harm to a designated heritage asset attracts considerable weight.
17. The appeal proposal would entail various other works to Flat 1, including the reinstatement of the original fireplace opening in the lounge and associated works; revealing further details of the retained original basement stairs in the kitchen; and, the opening up of the third vault from the lightwell. These works, subject to appropriate control through planning conditions, would restore or further reveal historic features and elements of the historic layout of the building. Consequently, these would be public benefits of the proposal, as well as private benefits for the occupiers in terms of further storage space and a fireplace.
18. The re-opening of the vault in the lightwell would improve the understanding of the historical layout and function of the building to some extent. Whilst the reinstatement of the fireplace opening, would reveal more of the original fabric of the building, the existing chimney in the lounge is already recognisable, at present. Furthermore, parts of the stairs are already visible in the kitchen and the necessarily boxed-in design proposed does not significantly enhance the understanding of their historical function. I therefore give these public benefits only limited to moderate weight.
19. The building was converted into flats more than two decades ago, and no evidence has been provided that Flat 1 was not capable of being used as a dwelling since then. Similarly, I see no reason why the current layout would not be capable of use as a one-bedroom flat now or in the future.
20. It is clear that the proposal would be beneficial to the needs of the current occupiers, providing more natural light to the kitchen, improving sightlines between the kitchen and lounge and providing further storage space for the family. However, it has not been shown that the current layout provides harmful living conditions for the current occupiers, and in any event, private benefits cannot outweigh the harm that would be caused to a designated heritage asset.
21. A one-bedroom flat is very unlikely to be suitable for a growing family in any building and I do not accept the appellant's premise that undertaking these works would reduce the likelihood of further changes to the property, thereby preserving its significance.

³ Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024 (the Framework)

22. In this case, I do not find the public benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harm to designated heritage assets I have identified, as set out above⁴.
23. For these reasons, the proposed works would detract from the significance of the listed building and consequently, from the significance of the BCA. They would, insofar as relevant, conflict with Policies DH1 (fostering innovation and conserving and enhancing the historic environment) and DH2 (heritage assets) of the Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies 2023, with the Barnsbury (CA10) Conservation Area Design Guidance 2002 and with the Framework.

Other Matters

24. I note the references to proposals at 14 Cloudesley Street, and that the appellant considers the works approved in June 2017 to be similar to the appeal proposals. Whilst some evidence to support the appellant's position has been provided, I note the Council disagrees with this assessment of similarity.
25. I am not fully familiar with 14 Cloudesley Street or the approved works, and I note that both national policy and the local development plan have changed since June 2017. In any event, each proposal should be considered on its individual merits, which is what I have done in this case.
26. I also note that previous applications for similar proposals at the appeal site were submitted and then withdrawn. This does not change my assessment of the appeal proposal and the harm to designated heritage assets I have found.

Conclusion

27. For the reasons given above, I conclude that Appeal A is dismissed and Appeal B is dismissed.

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR

⁴ Paragraph 215 of the Framework