
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 15 October 2025

by **A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th October 2025

Appeal A Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3366633

44 Wilton Square, Islington, London N1 3DW

- 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 Ms Monica Pellegrini against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/0114/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of existing rear extension, the creation of a new two storey extension and garden room, upgrading of existing glazing and the installation of a new gate to the front railings.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/V5570/Y/25/3366957

44 Wilton Square, Islington, London N1 3DW

- 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 Ms Monica Pellegrini against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/0115/LBC.
 - The works proposed are the demolition of existing rear extension, the creation of a new two storey extension and garden room, upgrading of existing glazing and the installation of a new gate to the front railings.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeals relate to the same scheme under different legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

Main Issue

3. The main issue for both appeals is the effect of the proposal upon the significance of the grade II listed building known as 42-45 Wilton Square and attached railings, and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Arlington Square Conservation Area (CA).
4. An additional main issue for Appeal A is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring dwellings to either side of the appeal building.

Reasons

Heritage

5. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) require the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Additionally, section 72 of the LBCA requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
6. The appeal building is a terraced dwelling. Four dwellings make up the terrace and the listed building entry covers the whole terrace. The terrace dates from 1851-52. It is modestly scaled, with two storeys plus a basement that is partly below street level. It is finished in yellow brick with decorated door and window surrounds and a heavy cornice. Front doors are accessed via steps. The steps and the adjacent basement wells are surrounded by cast iron railings that survive across the terrace. These elements all serve to form a pleasant composition that has historic and architectural significance. Additional significance is derived from internal features such as surviving staircases and plan form arrangements, and the different appearance of the terrace at the rear which although still ordered is much more modest.
7. The CA covers an area of well-preserved Victorian terraces, squares and green spaces. Its significance is derived from the regularity, consistency and order of its well composed historic buildings and the spaces that they define. The listed building subject of this appeal is one of these historic terraces, and forms part of Wilton Square, which is a key open space within the CA.
8. The proposal includes the formation of a gate in the front railings and steps to give access to the basement level from the street. A section of railings would be cut to form the opening, and this would be retained and modestly altered to form a gate. Masonry steps would be built behind this. As many as half of the dwellings in Wilton Square have been subject to this change, and the appellant refers to a recent scheme that was consented at No. 18 Wilton Square with limited detail. However, it is still correct to review the impact of each proposal on a case by case basis, and not to simply repeat an intervention that has been carried out previously without weighing its impacts and merits afresh.
9. The existing arrangement would appear to be original. Three of the dwellings that make up the listed terrace have not received this alteration and retain an original and intact arrangement at the front. The simple continuous boundary to the front of the plots and the way the original cast iron railings wrap around the basement wells and up each side of the steps is of considerable aesthetic value and an important part of the original design of the terrace. It elevates the status of the terrace and helps to unify it as a single architectural composition. Where a gate has been inserted, both at the appeal terrace and others that front Wilton Square, the quality and integrity of the original design has been degraded.
10. The proposal would erode this arrangement and irreversibly alter an original part of the terrace's design. It would harm the appearance of the terrace and harm a prominent section of historic fabric. Adding bars to the railings to form the gate, the addition of hinges, the lock and a knob would add visual clutter and detract from the simplicity of this original arrangement.
11. Furthermore, there is nothing to ensure that the gate would be left in the closed position. At my visit I saw that the visual impact of this change is increased when a

gate is left open and the original enclosure arrangement is more obviously disrupted.

12. The visual impact of the steps would be less, and only really discerned to those passing by at close proximity. The plans show that they would be clear of the basement window. Introducing a solid structure to the basement well could allow moisture and rainwater to find its way into the original masonry, which would harm the fabric of the listed building. The drawings refer to a 30mm gap that would be retained between the steps and the party wall, but they do not refer to any similar measures to protect the host dwelling from the transfer of moisture and build up of damp that could occur. The appellant suggests that the measures would extend all around the structure, but as this is not expressed on the drawings, I cannot be sure that the introduction of the steps would not harm the fabric of the building in the medium or long term.
13. Therefore, for the reasons given, the harm to the building's significance that would arise from the introduction of the gate and steps would be considerable. This element of the proposal would also result in a low level of harm to the character and appearance of the CA.
14. The proposal also includes the replacement of the rear extension to include raising its height to provide two storeys of additional accommodation to replace the existing one and a half storey extension. To access this the existing staircase would need to be remodelled.
15. The lowest run of stairs (referred to as staircase 1) is a modern flight of no significance. No harm would therefore arise from its loss. The section above is referred to as section 2. This staircase has been repaired. These repairs are described as inconsistent. However, at my visit I observed a coherent flight that retained a good proportion of primary historic fabric, including the banister and newel post which are likely to be original.
16. This would be reworked to raise the landing level to provide a higher point of access at the rear to the new study. The existing flight would be cut short and the stair to the basement replaced and altered by introducing a winder at the top and removing the half landing that is currently replicated on the floor above. Evidence suggests that the stairs differ between the different dwellings on Wilton Square. However, there is nothing to suggest which arrangement might be original. I note from the submissions that the arrangement at No. 45 matches the appeal building, but a winder stair would appear to provide basement access for no. 42; these dwellings form part of the listed terrace.
17. What is clear is that section 2 retains a good portion of historic fabric and forms a coherent flight of stairs that may have always been in this position. Indeed, there is no evidence to suggest otherwise. The proposal would see the layout of the stair altered considerably and the historic fabric reconfigured so that whilst what is left might look the part it would lack the authenticity of a stair that retains original fabric in its original configuration. The intervention would impact one flight of stairs within an interior that has seen a reasonable degree of alteration. The level of harm would therefore be low.
18. The opening through the rear wall would be reconfigured to form the door to the study and door to the bathroom below. This would be a vertical realignment.

Brickwork could be re-used, but the intervention would still alter primary historic fabric. A low level of additional harm would arise from these changes.

19. The rear extension would be higher than the existing. The top of its parapet would be close to the cill of the stair window, and it would be modestly wider, extending close to the reveal of the rear sitting room window. Although it would maintain a form that would be substantially lower than the existing building, for these reasons it would crowd the rear elevation by extending up close to existing openings. This would be visually uncomfortable and would detract from the simple appearance of the rear of the terrace where it has not been extended and thus cause a further low degree of harm.
20. It is clear from the evidence that many buildings in the CA feature similar rear extensions. This establishes a clear precedent for extending in this manner, however many of these have had a similar crowding effect, where aspects of the original rear elevation are obscured or not treated sensitively. They do not convince me that the scale of the proposed extension is an appropriate addition to the building that would not cause harm to its significance.
21. Separating the two parts of the extension by setting back the infill part from the two storey part would improve the situation as it would break up the overall massing. However, this alteration cannot be secured through a condition as suggested as it is a fundamental change to the proposal's design.
22. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) the harms would be less than substantial. The extent of harm from each intervention would vary from low for the changes to the staircase and the rear extension through to considerable for the changes to the front of the building. Taken together the extent of less than substantial harm would be of a medium level.
23. The harm would nevertheless be of considerable importance and weight. Paragraph 215 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
24. The new access would better connect the dwelling to the street and would be a benefit to its occupants. However, there is no legislative requirement to suggest that the access to the building needs to be improved by forming a second access to the street from basement level or that the current arrangement is unsafe.
25. The proposed gate and steps would allow a bicycle to be stored more easily at the dwelling and thus more convenient for day to day use. This is a public benefit on the basis that it would promote sustainable and active travel. It can attract no more than modest weight however as the arrangement would relate to a single dwelling, the ability to move a bicycle from the street to the basement would still be tricky for many and there can be no guarantee that the new access would be used for this purpose.
26. The benefit to moving bins and recycling boxes from the basement level to the street would be largely a private benefit however, as this is primarily down to how the home is managed. The current arrangement does not prevent bins and recycling boxes from being moved between the basement and highway for collection day and neither would the proposal guarantee that such receptacles would not be left hanging on railings or on the pavement outside of these times.

27. The benefit to the interior that would arise from the replacement of the bottom stair would be undermined by the alterations to the stair that would include the repositioning of historic fabric and the loss of the half landing arrangement.
28. The existing rear extension is poor quality in terms of both its construction and appearance. The proposal would deliver private benefits to the occupants of the dwelling in terms of improved living space and improved thermal comfort. The proposed extension cannot however be considered a public benefit as I have found that it would harm the significance of the building.
29. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. The public benefits carry limited weight and they are not sufficient to outweigh the level of harm identified.
30. In summary the proposal would harm the significance of the listed building and would fail to preserve the character or appearance of the CA. In reaching this decision I have had regard to the requirements of the LBCA. The proposal would fail to accord with Policies DH1 and DH2 of the Islington Local Plan 2023 (ILP), which seek to ensure that heritage assets are conserved.

Living conditions

31. The extension would be considerably taller than the existing extension. No. 45 Wilton Square is to the northwest of the appeal building, and the extension would stand alongside its rear garden's southeast facing boundary. Thus, an increase in height would reduce the level of daylight and sunlight reaching the neighbouring garden and dwelling for part of the day.
32. Detailed analysis of this impact provided by the appellant shows that the actual impact during the summer would be minimal and difficult to notice. During the winter months the impact would be greater when the sun is lower in the sky and shadows cast are more extensive. However, the scale of the surrounding buildings, including those to the southwest of the terrace, are likely to already significantly limit light levels to the rear gardens and rear windows of the terrace.
33. Therefore, given the orientation of the rear of the terrace and the scale of the existing buildings to the southwest and northwest, the impact on daylight and sunlight would be only modestly impacted by the additional height of the extension and a good level of amenity for the occupiers of No. 45 would be maintained.
34. In terms of outlook, the openings at the rear of No. 45 and the garden enjoy a pleasant southwest orientation. The prospect and the level of openness would be little changed by the additional height.
35. The proposed study window would be near to and face towards the side of the elevated terrace at the rear of No. 43 Wilton Square. It would be higher than the existing bathroom window and would thus increase the level of overlooking. Furthermore, the room would be used as a study, which could be occupied for significant periods, and would be quite different to the way a bathroom is used.
36. Although the terrace is already open and has limited privacy, the ability to look over it from other buildings is from a much greater distance. The proposal would introduce an unneighbourly relationship that would fail to maintain the amenity of the occupiers of No. 43.

37. In summary, the proposal would have a harmful impact on the living conditions of the occupants of No. 43 Wilton Square. It would not accord with Policy PLAN1 of the ILP which seeks to ensure that all development does not undermine the quality of existing development and provides a good level of amenity.

Conclusion

38. For the reasons given, the appeals should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR