



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **L Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/25/3373376

1 Kelvedon Mews, Islington, London N1 3FW

- 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 & Mrs Marine & Jean-Baptiste Gicquel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
- The application Ref is P2025/1970/FUL.
- The development proposed is roof extension to provide additional bedrooms for growing family.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appellants have referenced policies DM2.1 and DM3.5 in their statement. However, these would appear to be from Islington's Local Plan: Development Management Policies 2013 (the Local Plan), which was superseded by the adoption of Islington's new Local Plan. The new Local Plan consists of, amongst other matters, Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies (SDMP) September 2023. I have therefore disregarded references to these policies in my assessment.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of Kelvedon Mews and whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the nearby East Canonbury Conservation Area (the CA), a designated heritage asset,
 - the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of occupiers within 10 Warley House (No 10), with particular reference to outlook; and,
 - whether the proposed development would provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupiers of the appeal site (No 1) with particular regard to private amenity space.

Reasons

Character and appearance and Heritage Assets

4. The appeal property (No 1) comprises part-single and part two-storey end-of-terrace house, situated within a row of similar dwellings. There is no dispute that

Kelvedon Mews was constructed as part of the regeneration project of Dover Court Estate and the surrounding area¹, or that it falls just outside the CA.

5. No 1 and the remaining terrace have been constructed in a mews style with the front bounding directly onto the pavement and the rear bounding onto the private amenity spaces of Warley House. The roof, which is similar throughout the terrace, is finished in dark cladding and slopes towards the rear. The ridge height throughout the terrace is also similar, and there are punctuated gaps at the first floor, which gives the terrace a sense of rhythm.
6. The Council contend that the proposed development would extend the ridge height of No 1 from approximately 6.2 metres to approximately 8.5 metres. I acknowledge that the proposed roof extension would use similar materials to those in the current dwelling and would retain the break between it and its immediate neighbour. However, this would do little to mitigate the increase in height or assimilate the difference in its scale with the remaining mews. The proposed development would, in my mind, unbalance the composition of the mews, resulting in an unduly dominating and discordant feature within Kelvedon Mews.
7. Kelvedon Mews sits adjacent to the CA boundary. The CA is predominantly residential in character. The significance of this part of the CA is largely derived from its architectural merit and historical interest, including the terraces and groups of historic buildings depicted from the front and experienced within Ockendon Road and the public realm. From observations on site and evidence before me, I consider that No 1 has a neutral effect on the CA.
8. The Council contend that the proposed development would be visible from certain vantage points on Ockendon Road, but has not provided specific locations. From my observations, properties on Ockendon Road form a strong and almost continuous frontage to the street, restricting views towards the rear from the front and the public realm. I acknowledge that No 1 would be visible from the rear of a number of properties within the CA, and I saw that the junction with Wall Street provided clear views of Kelvedon Mews. However, I also saw that No 1 was largely obscured from the junction with Wall Street. Given that I have found the significance of this part of the CA to be largely experienced from the front of Ockendon Road and the public realm, even if the proposed development would extend above the butterfly roof of properties on Ockendon Road, from the evidence before me, and observations on site, I do not agree that, in this context, the proposed development would negatively impact the setting of the CA. Rather, the proposed development would preserve the character or appearance, and would therefore accord with SDMP Policy DH1.
9. The appellants have drawn my attention to paragraphs 5.156 to 5.159 of the Council's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (the SPD). Whilst the SPD acknowledges that contemporary roof extensions may be appropriate, it also states that rooflines should reflect the rhythm, harmony, and scale of the longer street frontage. I have found above that the proposed roof would unbalance the composition of the mews. This would also disrupt the rhythm and harmony of Kelvedon Mews. I therefore give its contemporary design limited weight.

¹ P2014/3363/FUL

10. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of Kelvedon Mews. Accordingly, it would conflict with SDMP policy PLAN1 and Policy D4 of the London Plan 2021, which collectively seek to ensure that development represents a high quality of design and makes a positive contribution to local character, and does not undermine the quality of existing development and streetscape. There would also be conflict with the overarching aims of the SPD.

Living conditions – existing occupiers of No 10

11. SDMP Policy PLAN1 relates to site appraisal, design principles and process. The Council have drawn my attention specifically to criterion B (i), which relates to context, and seeks to ensure, amongst other matters, that all development provides a good level of amenity, including consideration of, amongst other things, sense of enclosure and outlook.
12. The appellants' Daylight & Sunlight Study assessment identifies a number of habitable windows within Warley House which overlook the appeal site. The assessment also includes an outlook analysis from specific windows; however, this assessment omits any outlook analysis from windows within No 10.
13. I saw that No 10 has one habitable room on the ground floor which directly overlooks the rear elevation of No 1. This room has two apertures, comprising a glazed door with a slim glazed panel, both of which were obscurely glazed, and a clear glazed window. I also saw that the overhanging element from the upper floor restricts the occupants' outlook and that views were mainly directed predominantly towards the rear wall and roof of No 1, and limited amounts of skyline could be readily seen.
14. I acknowledge that the submitted plans show that approximately two-thirds of the proposed rear elevation of No 1 would be stepped away from the shared boundary wall with Warley House. However, plans also show that approximately one-third of the proposed rear elevation would project on a similar trajectory as the current boundary wall. This trajectory, coupled with the additional height of the roof, would dominate the outlook from the ground floor in No 10.
15. Furthermore, even if the degree of separation between No 1 and No 10 is unaltered, the additional height would most likely reduce the amount of skyline which would be seen from the ground floor of No 10 and dominate the outlook from this room. This would result in oppressive living conditions for the existing occupiers.
16. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for the existing occupiers of No 10 with regard to outlook. Accordingly, the proposal conflicts with SDMP policy PLAN 1, which seeks to ensure that all development provides good levels of outlook.

Living conditions - existing and future occupiers of No 1

17. SDMP policy H5 relates to private outdoor space. Criterion D states the minimum requirement for private outdoor space is 5 sqm on upper floors and 15 sqm on ground floors for 1-2 person dwellings, and for each additional occupant, an extra 1 sqm is required on upper floors and an extra 5 sqm on ground floors.

18. I saw that the existing outdoor space currently provides sufficient space for a bench-style seat, a small table, one upright chair, a number of potted plants and two children's bicycles, whilst maintaining an unobstructed pedestrian route to the front door.
19. There is no dispute that the existing private outdoor space provides approximately 9 sqm, or that this falls below the threshold of 25 sqm set by SDMP policy H5. I note in the supporting text alongside SDMP policy H5, the Council acknowledges that Islington is densely built up, and the provision of individual private outdoor space which meets the threshold can be challenging on some sites. I am also mindful that the Council contended that the level of private outdoor space for Kelvedon Mews was considered acceptable, on balance, in the original planning consent for the current occupancy level².
20. The proposed development seeks to extend No 1 by adding two additional bedrooms, which would ultimately result in a larger family-sized dwelling. The existing outdoor space would provide the only private external amenity space for the existing and future occupiers. As the outdoor space currently falls below what is considered to be an acceptable threshold, the external area would also unlikely provide sufficient space to accommodate the domestic paraphernalia, such as outdoor furniture or storage associated with the combined level of occupation. The lack of sufficient outdoor space would therefore likely severely compromise the living conditions of the existing and future occupiers.
21. Whilst I note the communal area to the front of Warley House would be available for any occupant to use, it is not in direct sight from No 1. I am mindful that the appellants contend that the proposal would provide additional accommodation for a growing family. However, I have nothing before me to satisfactorily demonstrate that this would provide sufficient space for secure and safe play for children, which SDMP policy H5 seeks.
22. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development would fail to provide acceptable living conditions for existing and future occupants with regard to external amenity space. The proposal would conflict with SDMP policy H5, which seeks to ensure a minimum level of private outdoor space.

Other Matters

23. I note that there was a level of support to the planning application from external consultation; however, the lack of objection from neighbouring properties does not in itself render the scheme acceptable.
24. The absence of harm on the living conditions of the existing nearby residents with regard to privacy, and sunlight and daylight are neutral matters that neither weigh in favour nor against the development.
25. The behaviour of the Council during the planning application with regard to contact between the appellant and agent, or whether it undertook a site visit, is not within the scope of my assessment, which must focus on the planning merits of the appeal proposal.

² 2014/3363/FUL

26. Although my attention has been drawn to paragraph 11 of the Framework, there is no part of the appellant's case which points to policies being out of date. As such, this decision falls to be determined within a normal planning balance.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

27. I acknowledge that the proposal would enable the appellant and their family to remain within No 1 for longer. However, a grant of planning permission would result in unacceptable harm to the living conditions of occupiers of No 10 in respect to outlook. It would also give rise to unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of Kelvedon Mews. The development conflicts with the development plan and I attach substantial weight to this finding against the appeal.
28. On balance, the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate a decision otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. I therefore conclude that it is proportionate and necessary to dismiss the appeal.

L Clark

INSPECTOR