



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9th February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/25/3374512

316 Caledonian Road, Islington, London N1 1BB

- 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 Guzel against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
- The application Ref is P2025/2302/FUL.
- The development proposed is erection of a mansard roof extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The appeal site lies within the Barnsbury Conservation Area (the CA), and under s72(1) of the Act, it is my duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. I have borne in mind this statutory duty when deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property, and whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.

Reasons

4. The significance of the CA is in part derived from its late Georgian and early Victorian architecture. In addition to fine sequences of squares and residential terraces, the CA contains shopping frontages along Caledonian Road and Liverpool Road, with rooflines of streets, particularly terraces, forming a significant component of the area's character and appearance.
5. The appeal property (No 316) is part of a terrace of buildings comprising 270 – 342 Caledonian Road, within the CA. The long terrace fronts the eastern side of Caledonian Road and faces a number of side streets, including the nearby Story Street. The terrace adjoins the rear gardens of Grade II-listed residential properties on Thornhill Square. Many of the roofs along the long terrace of buildings are hidden valley roofs behind front parapet walls. No 316 is therefore typical of the architecture and thus contributes positively to the CA.
6. Islington's Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document 2017 (the SPD) provides general advice on roof extensions and states, amongst other matters, that within CA's the roofline is often an important feature contributing to the character. It goes on to set out that proposals for roof extensions anywhere along an unaltered roofline within a conservation area will not generally be acceptable. Stating that,

when considering the scope for change to the front roofline, it is also necessary to consider the particular terrace/uniform street frontage in question. The SPD sets out criteria for roof extensions in conservation areas where the roofline is broken.

7. The first criterion of the SPD is determining the number of existing roof extensions and the extent to which the unity and consistency have been compromised. I saw that the majority of the roofs along the terrace within the immediate vicinity of No 316 had front parapet walls with valley roofs behind. I also saw that there were roof extensions on Caledonian Road; however, these were concentrated predominantly at the other end of the long terrace. In light of the expanse of existing roofs without roof extensions in close proximity to No 316, the proposal would compromise the unity and consistency of the roofline. Therefore, from my observations, I do not concur with the appellant's view that No 316 lies within an established pattern of mansard and roof extensions.
8. The second criterion relates to the length of the terrace in the context of opportunity for reconciling unity. The appeal property is part of a long terrace in the context of Caledonian Road. As mentioned above, there is a significant gap between it and the nearest mansard. The proposal would therefore not reconcile any previous loss of unity or consistency through filling gaps.
9. The SPD's final criterion refers to detailed individual consideration of the conservation area design guidelines. Paragraph 10.22 of Islington Barnsbury CA Design Guideline 2002 (CADG) advises that the Council may permit appropriate traditional roof extensions on the properties listed in Schedule 10.2, however the appeal property is not listed as one of these.
10. The proposal would be set approximately 1.53 metres behind the front parapet and would project approximately 1.6 metres above it. Its design would be traditional and comprise of traditional materials and provide additional accommodation comprising a bedroom, study, WC, and storage space for an existing residential unit.
11. The CADG also states that, outside those properties listed in Schedule 10.2, no roof extension visible from any street level position will be permitted, including long views from side streets and across open spaces. Whilst I acknowledge that plans submitted by the appellant¹ demonstrates that the proposed mansard would not be visible from the street-level, I saw that when exiting Story Street, No 316, and several immediate neighbours were the main focal point and that the unbroken roofline was clearly visible. It is also likely that it would be visible from longer range views along Caledonian Road, where the angle of view would be different. Furthermore, the proposed development would be at least partially visible from the upper floors of neighbouring properties opposite and to the rear. As a result, I find that the siting, height and form of the proposed development would disrupt the rhythm of the existing predominantly unaltered roofscape. It would therefore be harmful to the host building, the terrace, and the CA. As such, the proposal would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), the level of harm would be less than substantial.

¹ plan A301

12. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of properties² on Caledonian Road and Thornhill Square³ which they perceive to have mansards or roof alterations. While the appellant's aerial imagery shows properties on Caledonian Road and nearby streets, it omits to identify each property to which they are drawing my attention. Whilst I can see that some roofs on the imagery have been altered, I have not been provided with the circumstances surrounding their presence. As such, from the evidence before me, I cannot be certain that the circumstances are comparable. I have therefore considered the appeal before me on its individual planning merits.
13. I acknowledge that several properties in the southern section of Caledonian Road have mansard and roof alterations; however, these do not form part of the immediate street scene. With regard to any remaining properties, I have not been provided with the circumstances relating to their presence. Furthermore, their presence does not provide justification for harmful development.
14. With regard to Thornhill Square, these properties are located to the rear of No 316. Whilst the Google imagery shows that a number of properties on Thornhill Square have roof alterations, I have not been provided with the circumstances of their presence. In any event, I have evaluated the appeal proposal on its individual planning merits.
15. Whilst I acknowledge that there are trees on Caledonian Road, I saw that there were none immediately outside the appeal site. Where there were trees, they did not screen the appeal site and were not in leaf at the time of my site visit, thus allowing views through to the building and roofscape behind.
16. Regardless of the level of harm, the Framework indicates that great weight should be attributed to the conservation of heritage assets. In such circumstances, paragraph 215 of the Framework states that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Furthermore, in terms of public benefits, the Planning Practice Guidance advises that they should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just a private benefit.

Public Benefits

17. The appellant contends that any perceived change to the conservation area would be minimal and consistent with the established character. However, I have found above that the current roofscape within the immediate vicinity of Caledonian Road is largely unaltered. Whilst I concur that No 316 is located within a sustainable location, I have little before me to establish how the proposal would improve the quality of the existing housing stock. The proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant, which would be a small benefit. There would also likely be a small temporary economic benefit during its construction. The benefits however would be largely private, and I have not been made aware of any public benefits arising from the proposal that would outweigh the harm I have identified.
18. Consequently, there would not be clear and convincing justification for harm to, or loss of significance of, the designated heritage asset as required by paragraph 213

² Nos 296, 294, 292, 290, 286, 284, 282, 280, 278, 274, 237, 239, 241, 243, 245, 247, 249, 251, 253, 267, 269, 273, 275, and 285

³ Nos 43, 53, 54, 55 and 63

of the Framework, nor would the great weight that should be given to the heritage asset's conservation be outweighed.

19. In the absence of substantial public benefit, I conclude that the proposed mansard would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the host property and the CA. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with policies D3, D4 and HC1 of the London Plan 2021 and policies PLAN1, DH1 and DH2 of Islington Local Plan Strategic and Development Management Policies 2023, insofar as they seek to ensure proposals protect and enhance the unique character of the borough, including conservation areas.
20. There would also be conflict with guidance contained within the CADG and SPD, which collectively seek to preserve or enhance those qualities of the CA. Furthermore, the proposal would also be contrary to the provisions of the Framework in relation to heritage assets, which seeks to ensure that development is sympathetic to local character.

Other Matters

21. I acknowledge that the proposal follows a pre-application⁴ and that the appellant has attempted to overcome concerns previously raised. However, the amendments would still result in a proposal which would harm the character and appearance of the CA.
22. The absence of harm of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring residents with regard to daylight/sunlight and access are neutral matters in the overall planning balance, as this would be a likely requirement of a well-designed development. Furthermore, whether No 316 is within a sustainable location does not outweigh the harm identified above.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above, I find that the proposal conflicts with the development plan taken as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate the decision should be made other than in accordance with it.
24. I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

INSPECTOR

⁴ P2025/0705/MIN