

APPENDIX 3 – APPEAL DECISION



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 17 October 2017

Site visit made on 17 October 2017

by **S M Holden BSc MSc CEng MICE TPP FCIHT MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 14th November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/V5570/W/17/3175160

233-239 Pentonville Road, 241-243 Pentonville Road and 172-176 Kings Cross Road, Islington, London N1 9NG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Pencross Assets Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Islington.
 - The application Ref P2016/1864/FUL, dated 9 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of the existing buildings known as 233-239 Pentonville Road and 172-176 Kings Cross Road. The erection of a new part 2-storey (plus basement), part 7-storey (plus rooftop plant enclosure and basement) mixed use development comprising office (B1(a)) and retail (A1) floorspace, 4 residential units (C3) and associated public realm.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application form described the site address as set out above, although this does not accord with the Council's street naming and numbering records. However, for the avoidance of doubt it was agreed that the appeal site is outlined in red on the submitted site location plan. The Statement of Common Ground also set out an agreed description of the development which, although different from that on the application form, I have used in this decision.
3. The Council determined the application in accordance with the plans listed on its decision notice. The Addendum to the Statement of Common Ground, dated 12 October 2017, set out a series of tables listing all the plans relating to the proposal. These included amended plans submitted after the Council's decision, which sought to address some of its reasons for refusal. It was agreed at the Hearing that no third party would be prejudiced if I accepted these amended plans as part of my assessment and I have determined the appeal on that basis.
4. The Council refused the application for five reasons, the first of which related to the unacceptable loss of workspace suitable for small and medium enterprises. By the time of the Hearing the parties had agreed amended internal layouts which showed how an appropriate amount of such employment floorspace could be provided within the scheme. The Council was satisfied that this could be secured by condition, in the event that the appeal was allowed, and withdrew its reason for refusal on this basis.

5. The other amended plans addressed the Council's fourth reason for refusal. The Council was satisfied that provision of adequate cycle storage and suitable access for wheelchairs could be dealt with as a result of the amended internal layouts and secured by the imposition of appropriate conditions. Having studied the plans I see no reason to come to a different view. Two outstanding issues referred to in the Council's fourth reason for refusal were not resolved at the time of the Hearing. These related to a shared internal staircase and arrangements for the management of waste. I consider these to be secondary matters which I have dealt with accordingly.
6. At the Hearing it was confirmed that terms for a S106 planning obligation had been agreed to provide a contribution towards affordable housing and to mitigate the effects of the scheme in respect of local services and infrastructure. This agreement, which addressed the Council's fifth reason for refusal, has subsequently been completed and I have taken it into account in my decision.

Main Issues

7. The main issue is therefore the effect of the proposal on heritage assets which in this case are the Kings Cross Conservation Area, the locally listed buildings and the setting of the adjacent Grade II Listed Church.

Reasons

Heritage

8. The appeal site comprises three locally listed buildings, which are therefore non-designated heritage assets. The site also lies within the Kings Cross Conservation Area and abuts the Welsh Congregational Church, a Grade II Listed Building. I therefore have statutory duties to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area and to have special regard to preserving the setting of the church. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource which should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. It also advises that any harm or loss to designated heritage assets should require clear and convincing justification.

Locally Listed Buildings

9. The three locally listed buildings on the appeal site differ from one another in style, character and architectural detailing. Nos 233-239 is an example of a late 19th century tenement building. Nos 241-243 was a shop and public house dating from 1902. These are both constructed in an Arts and Crafts style with a rich variety of materials including brick, some rendered panels and terracotta detailing. The upper sections have retained their timber window frames. The ground floor elevations have been altered but a proportion of notable, original features have been retained. Nos 172-176 Kings Cross Road is smaller and includes some classical styling. It sits comfortably between the Grade II Listed Church and a larger building to the east and is thought to date from the end of the 19th century.
10. Considered in isolation these buildings have a pleasing appearance, but are not remarkable. Their dimensions are modest and they are not prominent in the street scene. The flank wall of No 241-243 which abuts the steps and open area adjacent to the entrance to the church on Pentonville Road is not attractive. However, features such as these are not untypical of the period in which they were erected. Together the buildings form part of the speculative and rather chaotic development that was taking place in the vicinity at the time. Their significance lies in the way

that they contribute positively to the character of the Conservation Area and reflect the area's history.

Kings Cross Conservation Area

11. The site is on the edge of the Kings Cross Conservation Area which was initially designated to protect the setting of Kings Cross Station. Westward views along Pentonville Road look towards it and the tall spires of St Pancras station. However, the significance of the conservation area is not restricted to those dominant and nationally important buildings. The arrival of the railways and canal led to rapid development of the surrounding area which is characterised by a variety of buildings, very different in scale to those of the two stations. The area has a dense urban character, a hierarchy of buildings and a mix of uses.
12. The haphazard and changing nature of development in the area also resulted in the use of many different materials. Stone was primarily reserved for the most important buildings. Elsewhere brick of differing colours dominates, although it is accompanied by stone detailing. This mix of architectural detailing adds considerable variety and interest to the street scene. The location of the appeal site on the periphery of the Conservation Area therefore does not necessarily diminish the contribution that the buildings upon it make to that Area. On the contrary, it makes them particularly vulnerable to changes which could undermine the integrity of the Conservation Area as a whole. Cumulative alterations and demolitions on the periphery of the Area would reduce its overall significance, which would then be more restricted and focussed on the larger, landmark buildings. This would be to the detriment of the role the Conservation Area played in the development of this part of London as a world class city.

Setting of the Listed Church

13. The Welsh Congregational Church was built in 1854 as the population of the area grew around Kings Cross station. The church is constructed of high quality stone and has attractive detailing, particularly the rose window which can be seen from Kings Cross Road. The vestibule entrance providing access at street level from Pentonville Road was added later. The densely developed residential areas which the church originally served have subsequently been demolished. Nevertheless, the building is an important example of a non-conformist church that was in the midst of a rapidly developing and changing urban area. It was quickly surrounded by other buildings and its setting never included public open space.
14. The change in levels between the two streets and the juxtaposition of the buildings on Pentonville Road has resulted in an awkward gap between Nos 241-243 and the vestibule entrance to the church. However, at street level much of its northern elevation is hidden behind the Pentonville Road frontage and the existing courtyard to the rear of the buildings on the appeal site is completely enclosed. The setting of the church is therefore tightly defined and its northern elevation is, and never was, a prominent feature within the street scene. Its lower sections appear squeezed between the adjacent properties, both behind and below the low wall and railings that mark the back of the footway in Pentonville Road.
15. However, the church's overall height and its distinctive, steeply pitched roof could be seen, and still can be, from the surrounding area. As many of the nearby buildings are either smaller or of a similar height, the church continues to stand out as a prominent and important building, even within its confined setting. It is these aspects of its setting that contribute to the significance of the church as part of the area's social and physical development.

Pentonville Road

16. With the exception of the gap at the church, the buildings on the south side of Pentonville Road in the vicinity of the appeal site are built to the back of the pavement. The height of Nos 241-243, with its flank wall and almost flat roof, is subordinate to, and sits comfortably alongside, the steep pitch of the church roof. The buildings then step up gradually along the street. The modern buildings to the east, including the adjoining modern office block Caledonia House, lie outside the Conservation Area. Where these other buildings are taller, their tallest elements are set further back from the footway.
17. The northern side of the street is completely different in character. The area, which is outside the Conservation Area, is dominated by larger, modern buildings. The footway is significantly wider and the lower elevations of the buildings are partially screened by street trees.

Design of the replacement building

18. The proposal would replace buildings of modest and differing heights with one that would be of a contemporary style and, on the Pentonville Road side of the site, would be significantly taller. The smaller footprint of the proposal would enable Nos 241-243 to be replaced by an area of new public open space which would expose more of the northern elevation of the church. The building would be constructed to the back of the footway on Pentonville Road from where it would appear to be six storeys in height.
19. The northern and western elevations would comprise large areas of glass of differing widths over the six floors separated by vertical finials. A seventh storey would be set back reducing its visibility from the street. The rooflights serving the basement, and which would link the two elements of the scheme, would only be seen from the public open space, rather than the street. The fenestration arrangement would give the building a strong vertical emphasis which would accentuate its height. Horizontal banding above the ground, first and fourth floors would separate different fenestration patterns. The building would be taller than Caledonia House and both taller and more bulky than the church.

Assessment

20. The proposal would result in the total and permanent loss of three locally listed buildings. In view of their positive contribution to the Conservation Area and their vulnerable position on its eastern edge, I consider that their demolition would be a notable and regrettable loss of part of the historic heritage of the Borough. The loss of these buildings would also be contrary to Policy DM2.3 (E) of Islington's Local Plan: *Development Management Policies* (DMP) which states that the Council will encourage the retention, repair and reuse of non-designated heritage assets, including locally listed buildings.
21. As the boundary of the appeal site with Caledonia House is also the boundary of the Conservation area, the demolition of the buildings would effectively erode the eastern extent of the Area. In addition it would reduce the diversity of historic buildings that are found within the Area, and which reflect its history and development. This would be harmful to the Conservation Area as a whole.
22. The replacement of the locally listed buildings with a modern seven-storey building would significantly alter the relationships between the buildings in this part of the Conservation Area, including the Listed Church. I consider the height of the building, rising from the back of the Pentonville Road footway would be excessive, projecting above Caledonia House and significantly above the ridge of the church.

23. The blank, cement rendered flank walls of the existing buildings would be replaced with large expanses of glazing, uniformly sub-divided and with strong vertical bands. The western elevation of the new building would be highly visible when looking in an easterly direction along Pentonville Road from where it would appear alien and out of keeping with the buildings to the west. In visual terms, it would effectively shift the boundary of the historic area in a westerly direction. This would harmfully erode the character and appearance of this sensitive, outer part of the Conservation Area.
24. The detailed design and materials of the proposal would jar with the prevailing character of other buildings within the conservation area. The proposal would be more in keeping with the contemporary buildings to the east and on the north side of Pentonville Road. However, as neither of these areas lies within the Conservation Area, I am not persuaded that the design proposed would be appropriate to this context, which is characterised by a greater variety of materials, shapes and architectural details.
25. The new building would dominate the street scene and give the church a subordinate appearance which would erode its significance. Enlarging the gap between the buildings, and introducing an area of public open space into this otherwise densely developed urban area, would be out of character with the street scene and would reduce the sense of enclosure on the church's northern side. The gap would accentuate the height and mass of the proposed building, which would tower above the church, the street and the proposed open space. Its height, which would project significantly above the ridge of the church's roof, would result in the church being dwarfed and overpowered by it.
26. In any event, the open space would not fully reveal the church's northern elevation, but would be perched awkwardly above the existing steps that lead from the street to its lower ground floor entrance. The new square would overlook this area on one side, whilst on the other it would overlook the area between the two elements of the new building. The privacy and intimacy of the enclosed courtyard to the rear of the existing buildings would be lost. I consider these changes would be harmful to setting of the church and the contribution that the tightly packed buildings around it make to the significance of this non-conformist building.
27. The mass and height of the proposed replacement element on Kings Cross Road would be similar to that of the existing building and, in this respect, would be acceptable. However, I consider the contemporary design with its proposed fenestration arrangement would be difficult to assimilate successfully within this street frontage. With one notable exception immediately adjacent to the church, this street has retained its historic buildings with a mix of heights, materials and detailing. It therefore seems to me that the proposal would not integrate effectively with the prevailing character and appearance of the street scene in this part of Kings Cross Road. This would be to the detriment of the Conservation Area as a whole.
28. Drawing the threads of my assessment together, I conclude that the demolition of the locally listed buildings would be a notable and regrettable loss of non-designated heritage assets which make a positive contribution to the significance of the Conservation Area. The loss of these buildings would also be harmful to the Kings Cross Conservation Area and would adversely affect the setting of the Listed Church. These harms would be compounded by the excessive height, bulk and mass of the proposed replacement building and the introduction of a public open space which would be harmful to the tightly defined setting of the church. Consequently, these heritage assets would be neither preserved nor enhanced.

29. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy 7.8 of the London Plan, Policy CS9 of Islington's Core Strategy and Policies DM2.1 and DM2.3 of Islington's Local Plan: DMP. These policies, amongst other things, seek to conserve and enhance the historic significance of heritage assets, including through their retention, repair and re-use. They also require new development to be sympathetic and complementary in their form, scale and appearance to the particular locality. In terms of the Framework the combination of harms I have identified would be less than substantial. Nevertheless, the totality of harm to designated heritage assets is a matter to which the Courts have indicated I should give considerable weight and importance in the planning balance.

Other Matters

30. The issue of the shared emergency staircase was discussed at the Hearing. The proposed layout would not provide a total separation of access for residents and office workers. I concur with the Council that this would not be entirely satisfactory from the point of view of security for either group. However, I do not consider it would be sufficiently harmful for the scheme to fail, if the development had been acceptable in all other respects.
31. The issue of addressing the management of waste is rather more difficult to resolve. The proposed internal layout would result in a need to provide a storage area somewhere outside the building for bins awaiting collection. This would be in an area of restricted pavement width on a Red Route with frequent buses and a significant volume of traffic. The appellants presented alternative options for addressing this at the Hearing. The Council has subsequently indicated that these would not deal adequately with its concerns. If I had been minded to allow the appeal, I would have sought a final comment from the appellant on this matter.
32. However, in order for a proposal to be considered an outstanding design within this sensitive part of the Conservation Area, I consider that it should function efficiently and effectively, without causing problems to users of the adjoining footway or highway. The apparent absence of a satisfactory solution demonstrates that the appeal proposal would fail to meet the high standard of design required. However, in view of my conclusions on the main issue, this matter is not a determining factor in my assessment of the scheme.

Planning balance

33. The appeal site is in the Central Activities Zone (CAZ), Employment Priority Area and within a short walk of Kings Cross/St Pancras Station. It is therefore in an attractive and accessible area, ideally suited to providing high quality office space to enhance the area's role in supporting London's strategic business role. The provision of a notable increase in Grade A office floorspace would contribute to the growth of the Borough's economy and would generate jobs both during construction and in the longer term.
34. The provision of an adequate quantum of space for small and medium sized enterprises within the scheme would compensate for the loss of such space within the existing buildings. The inclusion of retail space would help to retain the mix of uses which contributes to the vibrancy of the area. In recent years office floorspace in the Borough has been lost to residential use as a result of permitted development rights allowing conversions. Although this trend is not expected to continue, the economic benefits of providing additional high quality office space in this highly accessible location is a significant factor which weighs in the scheme's favour.

35. The proposal would provide four additional residential units, contributing to the Borough's housing targets and supporting the mixed uses of the area. In addition the proposal would provide a financial contribution towards the delivery of affordable housing. These social benefits also weigh in the scheme's favour. Contributions to other local services and infrastructure which have been secured through the Section 106 agreement are necessary to ensure compliance with the development plan. They are therefore a neutral factor in the overall balance.
36. The public open space could be used in conjunction with the proposed retail space on the ground floor of the proposed building. However, its creation would not integrate satisfactorily into the surrounding densely developed urban grain and would harm the setting of the Listed Church. I therefore do not consider it would be a public benefit arising from the development.
37. The appellants had identified constraints within the existing buildings which could make a refurbishment scheme difficult to achieve. However, no such scheme had been investigated, even though the Council's Design Review Panel provided clear advice at the pre-application stage that retention of these locally listed buildings would be preferable to their replacement. Such an approach would also accord with the development plan. There was therefore a lack of definitive evidence to indicate what level of public benefits could be delivered through an alternative scheme which would be less harmful to the heritage assets.
38. In assessing the proposal, I have also had regard to the 2008 appeal decision¹ in which the previous Inspector concluded that the acceptability, or otherwise, of the loss of those buildings was primarily dependent on the quality of the replacement. The adoption of the Islington's Local Plan DMP in 2013, has strengthened local policy with respect to the conservation of non-designated heritage assets since that decision. There is therefore a strong presumption in favour of the retention of these buildings.
39. I have concluded that the proposal would harm the Kings Cross Conservation Area, the setting of the Grade II Listed Church and result in the notable and regrettable loss of three locally listed buildings, all of which contribute to the significance of the historic development of this part of London. Collectively these harms to the heritage assets, both designated and non-designated, carry considerable weight in my assessment of the proposal. Their loss could only be justified if the proposed replacement was of an exceptional quality and delivered other public benefits which outweighed the harm I have identified.

Conclusion

40. Taking all these factors into account, I was not persuaded that a clear and convincing justification for permitting the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets has been demonstrated. Neither was I convinced that quality of the scheme and its public benefits amounted to material considerations that outweigh the conflict with the development plan. For this reason, and having regard to all other relevant matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/V5570/E/08/2061151 and APP/V5570/A/08/2061148

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Simon Wallis: Director with Savills
BA(Hons), MA Planning, MRTPI

Richard Brooks: Director Heritage with Turley Heritage
BSc(Hons) MTP(UC) MRTPI IHBC

Giles Heather: Squire and Partners
M.A. Oxon(2000) BSc(2002) Dip Arch(2007)

Aimee Squires: Senior Planner with Savills
BA(Hons) DipPM

Tom Cosgrove QC Cornerstone Barristers

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Jan Slominski: Principal Planning Officer
(Major Applications Team)

Kristian Kaminski: Deputy Team Leader
(Design and Conservation)

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED DURING THE HEARING

- Doc 1 Extract from the Council's Annual Monitoring Report 2015
- Doc 2 Letter of 25 June 2015 setting out the Islington Design Review Panel's comments in relation to pre-application ref: Q2015/1278/MJR
- Doc 3 Consolidated list of agreed conditions
- Doc 4 Options for external arrangements for waste collection

APPENDIX 4 – DRP RESPONSE LETTERS



CONFIDENTIAL

ATT: Aimee Squires
Savills
33 Margaret Street
London
W1G 0JD

Planning Service
Planning and Development
PO Box 333
222 Upper Street
London
N1 1YA
T 020 7527 2389
F 020 7527 2731
E Luciana.grave@islington.gov.uk
W www.islington.gov.uk

Our ref: Q2018/2706/DRP

Date: 28/08/18

Dear Aimee Squires,

ISLINGTON DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

RE: 233-243 Pentonville Road, 172-176 King's Cross Road, N1 9NG (pre-application ref. Q2018/1490/MJR)

Thank you for attending Islington's Design Review Panel meeting on 14 August 2018 for a first review of the above scheme. The proposed scheme under consideration is for part retention and extension of the existing buildings to provide new retail (225sqm GIA) and office floorspace (2,655sqm GIA).

Review Process

The Design Review Panel (DRP) provides expert impartial design advice following the 10 key principles of design review established by Design Council/CABE. The scheme was reviewed by Richard Portchmouth (Chair), Ben Gibson, Dorian Crone and Tim Attwood on 14 August 2018 including a site visit, presentation from the design team followed by a question and answer session and deliberations at the offices of the London Borough of Islington. The views expressed below are a reflection of the Panel's discussions as an independent advisory body to the Council.

Panel's observations

The Panel welcomed the opportunity to comment on the new scheme and were supportive of the ambition to provide better quality office space, and active retail frontages, on this site. The previous planning history was noted and the reworking of the refused application to deliver similar benefits was commended by Panel members. The reason for the loss of a residential element was understood and supported.

The Panel considered the locally listed buildings to be worthy of retention as interesting historic buildings that contribute to the character of the area. It was observed that the buildings fronting Pentonville Road are Arts and Crafts in style, presenting a strong architectural language. The approach of an integrated façade retention was welcomed, but panel members considered that new additions should seek to respond to, and bring out their qualities. It was suggested that the existing roof to nos.233-239 appears somewhat understated and that often Arts and Crafts buildings have more striking, steeply pitched roofs. Panel members, therefore, suggested that the introduction of a larger pitched roof, incorporating an additional floor as proposed, could be a positive addition in principle.

Panel members expressed a range of views regarding the way in which the new roof could be treated, but it was generally agreed that a contemporary addition would be appropriate. However, Panel members shared concern with regard to the scale and positioning of the large dormer windows between the gables. It was pointed out that the floor levels of traditional buildings normally have proportional relationships, in their scale and fenestration, and therefore double height dormer windows at attic level would be at odds with the grain and language of the floors below. The dormer window precedents shown were considered to confirm this and the Panel suggested that an analysis of the locally listed building was missing. Consequently, Panel members considered that neither the initial nor revised designs to be suitable in terms of their relationship with the host building. Panel members did consider that a metal finish could be appropriate, but that it should complement the tones of the existing brickwork. Whilst finding the rhythm of the chimney stacks to be important, and their loss regrettable, the Panel did not consider it logical for them to be rebuilt as part of a roof extension, unless they had a purpose such as natural ventilation chimneys.

The Panel queried whether it might be possible to make more of the proposed courtyard to further enhance the amenity of the office space.

The Panel considered that there were similar issues regarding the extension to 241-243, and that it was not necessary for it to have a commonality with that of 233-239. Panel members suggested that it could be extended in a traditional manner or with a contrasting addition – providing that it too responded to the host building as above. The Panel strongly encouraged enhancements to the rendered flank elevation, ideally that it be rebuilt in brick and also suggested that fenestration could be introduced.

Summary

The Panel commended the proposed rejuvenation of the locally listed buildings and supported the quantum of development put forward. Concerns were not raised regarding scale, mass and bulk, but it was strongly felt that the proposed roof extensions and shop fronts should relate better to their host buildings. In particular, the dormer windows, which should respond to, and have a sympathetic and coherent relationship with, the fenestration pattern below. The Panel advised that a greater understanding and engagement with the qualities of the composition of the existing buildings would enable a scheme to be presented that is much more robust to challenges. The Panel looked forward to the opportunity to comment on a revised approach at a future review.

Thank you for consulting Islington's Design Review Panel. If there is any point that requires clarification please do not hesitate to contact me and I will be happy to seek further advice from the Panel.

Confidentiality

Please note that since the scheme is at pre-application stage, the advice contained in this letter is provided in confidence. However, should this scheme become the subject of a planning application, the views expressed in this letter may become public and will be taken into account by the Council in the assessment of the proposal and determination of the application.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lucy' or 'Luciana', written in a cursive style.

Luciana Grave

Design Review Panel Coordinator

Design & Conservation Team Manager



CONFIDENTIAL

ATT: Aimee Squires
Savills
33 Margaret Street
London
W1G 0JD

Planning Service
Planning and Development
PO Box 333
222 Upper Street
London
N1 1YA
T 020 7527 2389
F 020 7527 2731
E Luciana.grave@islington.gov.uk
W www.islington.gov.uk

Our ref: Q2018/2706/DRP

Date: 27 November 2018

Dear Aimee Squires,

ISLINGTON DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

RE: 233-243 Pentonville Road, 172-176 King's Cross Road (pre-application ref. Q2018/1490/MJR)

Thank you for attending Islington's Design Review Panel meeting on 13th November 2018 for a second review of the above scheme. The proposed scheme under consideration is for Part retention and extension of the existing buildings to provide new retail and office floorspace. (officer's description).

Review Process

The Design Review Panel provides expert impartial design advice following the 10 key principles of design review established by Design Council/CABE. The scheme was reviewed by Richard Portchmouth (Chair), Ben Gibson, Dorian Crone and Tim Attwood on 13/11/2018 including a presentation from the design team followed by a question and answer session and deliberations at the offices of the London Borough of Islington. There was no site visit as this was a second review. The views expressed below are a reflection of the Panel's discussions as an independent advisory board to the Council.

Panel's observations

The Panel welcomed the opportunity to provide follow up comments on the scheme.

Panel members hoped to see further analysis of the proportions and fenestration pattern of the existing buildings, in order to understand the rationale behind the additions. Nevertheless, the Panel generally found the revisions to be convincing with regards to Nos.233-239 Pentonville Road. Some concerns were however raised in relation to the detailing of the lower level dormer windows in between the gables, with the resolution of their relationship with the edge of the roof, gutter and window below, key to their success. Some Panel members also found the proposed spacing and rhythm of the higher level dormers to be unconvincing. It was suggested that it may be a more comfortable arrangement if they did not directly correspond to the bays below, and that it could be worth exploring grouping the windows and/or positioning the windows to the extension in between the gables, rather than directly on top of them.

Of the various options presented for the extension of 241-243, Option 1 was considered to be the most successful by the Panel. Some Panel members considered Option 2 to also be suitable, but others found the loss of integrity of the existing building to be negative, and the

relationship with neighbouring buildings to be too dominant – particularly given that it would challenge the primacy of the listed Church. The suggestion was also made that a combination of Options 2 & 3 could be appropriate, with an additional sheer storey, but with a hipped roof above. Generally, Options 3 & 4 were not considered to be appropriate.

The Panel considered the proposed simple, elegant façade of the rear elevation to be particularly successful.

The Panel reminded that the resolution of the shopfronts was also important, but were confident that an appropriate design would be delivered.

Summary

The Panel were pleased with revisions to the scheme, finding that many of their concerns had been successfully addressed. Comments were made in relation to fine tuning the proposals and a preference was expressed with regards to the options presented.

Thank you for consulting Islington's Design Review Panel. If there is any point that requires clarification please do not hesitate to contact me and I will be happy to seek further advice from the Panel.

Confidentiality

Please note that since the scheme is at pre-application stage, the advice contained in this letter is provided in confidence. However, should this scheme become the subject of a planning application, the views expressed in this letter may become public and will be taken into account by the Council in the assessment of the proposal and determination of the application.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lucy', written in a cursive style.

Luciana Grave

Design Review Panel Coordinator
Design & Conservation Team Manager