



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2026 by J Reed MPlan

Decision by Mr R Walker BA HONS DIPTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 26th March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/D/25/3376483

4 Arlington Avenue, Islington, London N1 7AX

- 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 Helen Nowicka against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref is P2025/1212/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension with solar panels.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Arlington Square Conservation Area.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal dwelling 4 Arlington Avenue is a two storey mid terrace dwelling set in a terraced block of 7 other similar properties located in the Arlington Square Conservation Area (the CA). The significance of the CA derives from its strong visual unity of its 1840's terraces of mainly two storey plus basement houses, and the buildings which are visible from the canal contribute to the industrial vernacular of the CA's character.
5. The appeal dwelling's block on Arlington Avenue is locally listed with the register of locally listed buildings identifying the special qualities of No's. 2-14 (even) Arlington Avenue as being their design, ornament and important street value. The terraced block possess a generally uniform appearance due to their evenly proportioned fenestration and traditional appearance. Whilst two properties within the group have undergone alterations to their roof notwithstanding this, I consider the terrace to have a pleasing cohesive appearance which makes a positive contribution to the CA.
6. Nos 2 and 6 Arlington Avenue either side of the appeal dwelling both possess historic mansard roof extensions with the remainder of the block unaltered. I observed on my site visit that visibility of the addition at No 6 was limited with the

only views available in the distance from New North Road. In contrast the addition at No 2 is highly prominent and can be seen in both long and close range views on Arlington Avenue in particular as well as in private views such as from upper floor windows of neighbouring properties. The proposed mansard roof extension at the appeal site would sit significantly above the parapet wall to the front and as a result be highly visible and would further disrupt the degree of unbroken uniformity to the roof level of the terraced block. This prominence would be further exacerbated by the proposed solar panels which would be sited above the proposed windows resulting in them appearing as highly incongruous and failing to respect the character of the surrounding area.

7. The mansard extension would be clad in appropriate materials, retain the dwellings butterfly roof shape and its windows would respect the pattern of the host dwelling. Moreover, the overall scale would be subservient in proportion to the dwelling as a whole. However, these elements of the design would not alter or outweigh my concerns regarding the further disruption to both the roof profile of the dwelling and the broad uniformity of the terrace roof scape.
8. Consequently, the proposed development would not be compatible with the appeal dwelling and would harm the general architectural consistency and unity of both the front and rear elevations of the terrace. It would represent a harmful incremental change which would erode the appearance of the terrace, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the CA.
9. In reaching my conclusions, I have also had regard to the Islington Urban Design Guide (2017) (the UDG). The UDG states that successful proposals will be both sympathetic to the host building and harmonise with the predominant roofline in the vicinity. The Arlington Square Conservation Area Design Guidelines (2002) also states set-back roof extensions will be permitted only if they and any necessary works to the party parapet walls are not visible from any street level or public area. Rear elevations should be mansarded to reduce their visual impact with roof extensions visible from the street, including long views from neighbouring streets, will not be allowed.
10. I observed on my site visit there were some other mansard roof extensions present within the wider street scene including those at Nos 2 and 6 I have highlighted above. However, the presence of the existing mansard roof extensions does not represent a defining characteristic of the vicinity around the appeal site with most of the dwellings roof spaces unaltered. It was also apparent that the existing mansard roofs would not have met the design requirements of the current UDG. This is reinforced in the Arlington Square Conservation Area Design Guidelines outlining that the ad-hoc construction of roof extensions is considered damaging to the architectural unity of the area and the character and appearance of the conservation area. The appeal proposal would further erode this architectural unity to the detriment of the character and appearance of the CA.
11. Turning to the examples cited by the appellant regarding the percentages of roof extensions present at properties in the surrounding CA on certain streets. In the cases of Linton Street, Rees Street and Rydon Street the percentage of roof extensions is over 50% and in line with the Arlington Square Conservation Area Design Guidelines if a majority of properties possess roof extensions on a street, then future proposals may be supported. In contrast Arlington Avenue only has 37% of properties with roof extensions which is not a majority and therefore any

future proposals would be resisted as per the guidance in the Arlington Square Conservation Area Design Guidelines and the case with the appeal proposal. I also note the planning approvals referenced by the appellant to St Paul Street. I have however not been passed any further details or made aware of their specific circumstances. I cannot therefore be sure there are sufficient similarities with these examples and the appeal scheme before me such that it would alter my conclusions on the main issue.

12. I also note the previous approval¹ at the appeal site for a mansard roof. However, this was granted planning permission prior to the adoption of current planning legislation and guidance and I therefore give this limited weight.
13. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that special attention must be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. Drawing the above together, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the CA. As a result, the expectations of the Act have not been met, and the proposal would harm the significance of this designated heritage asset. In this instance, due to the presence of other roof alterations the harm to the significance of the CA would be 'less than substantial' and at the lower end of the spectrum but, nevertheless, of great weight.
14. In accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), less than substantial harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use. In this regard, the proposal would provide additional living space for the appellant's family however this is not a public benefit as such. There would be some minor public economic benefits as a result of the employment generated through the construction phase, however this benefit is attributed limited weight, as the extent and duration of employment would be low due to the domestic scale of the proposed development.
15. The appellant also contends that the proposal includes scope for environmental benefits including reducing carbon emissions and increasing water and energy efficiency, which would be public benefits through the efforts to tackle climate change. However, there is no substantive evidence that only way of securing such improvements to the host dwelling are through the design of the scheme before me limiting the weight I give this matter. The site-specific considerations put forward attract limited weight and are not sufficient to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified and the great weight I apply to the CA's conservation in line with the Framework
16. In this regard the proposal would conflict with Policies D4 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021), Policies PLAN1, DH1 and DH2 of Islington's Strategic and Development Management Policies (2023) as well as the Framework and the Act in so far as they relate to this main issue. These seek amongst other things that development is of a high quality that conserves or enhances the significance of the CA.

¹ 90/0471

Other Matters

17. I also note the appellants concerns regarding the Councils assessment of the case. Whilst I understand the applicant's frustrations, the Council's handling of the case has not affected my consideration of the planning merits of the scheme.

Conclusion and Recommendation

18. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004 outlines that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
19. For the reasons given above, the appeal scheme would conflict with the development plan and there is nothing sufficiently compelling to find otherwise. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Reed

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

20. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

Mr R Walker

INSPECTOR