



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: 09 July 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3361457

116 Barnsbury Road, Islington, London N1 0ES

- 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 and Mrs O'Connor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2024/3807/FUL.
The development proposed is the enlargement of existing roof extension with associated restoration of butterfly roof parapet at the rear. Installation of a new rooflights and associated alterations.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/Y/25/3361458

116 Barnsbury Road, Islington, London N1 0ES

- 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 Mr and Mrs O'Connor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2024/3804/LBC.
 - The works proposed are the enlargement of existing roof extension with associated restoration of butterfly roof parapet at the rear. Installation of a new rooflights and associated alterations.
-

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, whilst Appeal B concerns an application for listed building consent. 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 listed buildings, I have had regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

5. The description of the proposal on the appeal forms has been changed from that contained on the application forms. I have used the amended description of the proposal in the banner heading above.

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. 116 Barnsbury Road is a Grade II listed building, which forms part of a short terrace opposite Barnard Park that dates from the early 19th century¹. The buildings are three storeys in height, plus basements, and the appeal building and No 110, have non-original rooftop extensions.
8. Other than the roof extension, No 116 is fairly typical of this short terrace, previously known as Arundel Terrace, which is constructed from yellow and brown stock bricks. At the front, No 116 has a white stucco treatment at ground floor and basement, with a lightwell separated from the footpath by vertical metal railings. There is a stepped entrance to a 6 panelled door, bounded by two columns and with an arched fanlight above.
9. The windows are traditional sash windows with iron balcony details at first floor level, whilst the rooftop parapet wall largely screens the extension and fully screens the associated terrace area, from view. The terrace is drained via an opening in the front parapet wall and a hopper leading to a horizontal and then vertical downpipe. There is a considerable amount of vegetation on the front elevation provided by a mature climbing plant, which extends to No 114 next door.
10. At the rear, the traditional butterfly roof design has been lost with the rooftop extension, with a further small casement window added. The fenestration is predominantly Georgian six-over-six sash windows, although there are several exceptions, and a contemporary ground floor and basement level extension has also been constructed.
11. Insofar as it relates to these appeals, the significance of the listed building stems from its historical development as part of a terrace of similar houses overlooking Barnard Park, the largely traditional design and architectural details, and from the traditional materials used.
12. The terrace containing the appeal building is located within the Barnsbury Conservation Area (the BCA), which has a predominantly residential character, and contains many fine examples of late Georgian and early Victorian buildings, within maturely landscaped streets, and squares.
13. Insofar as it relates to these appeals, the significance of the BCA stems from the historical development of the area, the architectural and historical interest of the buildings to be found there, and its verdant character and appearance.
14. As previously mentioned, the appeal building contains a rooftop extension, which extends from the main rear elevation of the building over roughly half the roof area. A timber-decked terrace covers the remainder of the roof area towards the front of

¹ Numbers 102-116 (even) and attached railings - List Entry Number: 1298110

the building, with brick chimney stacks positioned fairly centrally by the two party walls with Nos 114 and 118. A parapet wall at the front of the building screens the existing extension from view from Barnsbury Road and from Barnard Park².

15. The extension is currently used as a bedroom, and is formed by the raised rear elevation wall of the main building, which screens the roof from view to the rear. The dual-pitched slate roof spans the building and the ridgeline is located by the rearmost point of the chimney stacks. The front elevation of the extension contains a small outrigger on the northern side and has tripartite fenestration, with the central element a French window, which provides access to the terrace area.
16. The proposal would entail the creation of a larger rooftop extension and consequently a reduced terrace area. The extension would continue to contain a bedroom, with a small partition for a toilet and washbasin added at the rear.
17. The proposed extension would span the width of the building and would extend from the rear wall of the main building to beyond the frontmost point of the chimney stacks. The roof and front and rear walls of the extension would be constructed from lead shingles and there would be double glazed doors at the front, providing access to the terrace.
18. The ridgeline of the extension would be raised a little and moved forward, in comparison with the existing extension. The rear part of the roof would contain two rooflights, with the front part of the roof having a shallower gradient and containing a single rooflight.
19. Consequently, the scale, massing, design, position and materials of the proposed extension mean it would be significantly different to the existing.
20. I am satisfied that in views from Barnsbury Road, the parapet wall would mean the proposed extension would not be visible. However, I am not satisfied that in longer distance views from Barnard Park, the parapet wall would screen the upper parts of the proposed extension from view.
21. I note the information provided regarding the topography of Barnard Park relative to the appeal property and the section extract showing the park, Barnsbury Road and the appeal building³. I observed the topography of the area when I visited the site and I note the topography plan does not provide any indication of the elevation of Barnsbury Road and does not show the parkland rising away from the footpath by Barnsbury Road. The section drawing is unscaled and similarly, does not accord with my observations of the topography of the park.
22. In summertime, the foliage of the many trees in Barnard Park would block views of the proposal from the park. However, during late autumn, winter and early spring, it is very likely that it would be visible.
23. The upper part of the rear elevation wall would be altered to recreate the butterfly roof profile that is characteristic of the rear of the listed terrace, including next door at No 114. However, Nos 118 and 120, next door to the north and which are not part of the listed terrace containing the appeal building, do not have butterfly roof profiles.

² Figure 6 of the appellant's Heritage Statement

³ Appendix 1 of the appellant's Grounds of Appeal

24. The appellant is also seeking to alter the rainwater drainage system at the front of the building, removing a horizontal drainage pipe that currently connects to the downpipe at the northern side of the elevation and creating a new opening in the parapet wall for rainwater to discharge to the downpipe via a hopper. However, it is not clear from the evidence whether the existing drainage arrangement at the front is original.
25. The existing rear elevation drawing does not accurately show the existing drainage pipework, including external rainwater and sewer drainage pipes, that I observed when I visited the site.
26. I also note that a toilet and washbasin would be provided as part of the proposed extension. No such facilities are in the existing extension and so new water supply and wastewater/sewerage removal pipework would be needed to enable them to function. The proposed rear elevation drawing does not show any sewer drainage pipes. Furthermore, the elevated position of the rainwater hopper in the reinstated butterfly roof profile means it would be ineffective at dealing with rainwater from the roof of the proposed extension.
27. The design, materials, scale and massing of the proposed extension would detract from the architectural and historic interest of the listed building. Were the existing rainwater drainage infrastructure at the front original, then its loss too would be harmful.
28. In addition, there would almost certainly be a further loss of historic fabric in order to accommodate the infrastructure for the proposed toilet and washbasin in the extension, details of which are not shown on the submitted drawings. Furthermore, the elevated, and so ineffective, position of the rainwater drainage hopper shown on the rear elevation drawing would be very likely to cause water ingress at the rear, which would damage the building.
29. This would cause less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building.
30. 116 Barnsbury Road currently makes a positive contribution to the significance of the BCA. As a result, 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. Any harm to a designated heritage asset attracts considerable weight⁴.
31. Whilst the reinstatement of the butterfly roof profile at the rear would be consistent with part of the original design of the building, the enlarged extension would be readily visible behind it, clearly showing the original butterfly roof had been lost. Furthermore, the contemporary design, the increased scale and massing, and the contrast in colour and materials between the retained brickwork and the lead shingles, would mean the proposed extension would be more visually prominent and incongruous, in views from the rear. Overall, I consider the reinstatement of the butterfly roof profile would be a very limited public benefit.
32. The proposal is said to improve the thermal performance of the building once the extension was constructed. However, this would be largely a private benefit for the occupier.

⁴ Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework December 2024 (the Framework)

33. Even if I were to accept the rainwater infrastructure at the front of the building was not original, and so its removal, subject to appropriately worded conditions to control the details, a benefit, I do not find the very limited public benefits of the proposal would outweigh the harm to designated heritage assets I have identified, as set out above⁵.
34. 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 Policy HC1 (heritage conservation and growth of the Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London 2021, 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 (SDMP), with the Barnsbury (CA10) Conservation Area Design Guidance 2002, Islington Urban Design Guide 2017, and with the Framework.
35. The Council has not provided me with a copy of Policy PLAN1 of the SDMP, so I can find no conflict with this policy.

Conclusion

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

Andrew Parkin

INSPECTOR

⁵ Paragraph 215 of the Framework