

Consultation Statement



Draft Urban Design Guide SPD

June 2016

Regulation 12(a) Consultation Statement

Urban Design Guide SPD Preliminary Consultation Statement

1. Purpose and background

The statement has been prepared in accordance with regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended) which sets out the requirements for public participation and for preparing a consultation statement. It accompanies a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which provides guidance on how urban design principles should be applied to ensure that new development successfully contributes to making the borough a better place. The SPD is applicable to all new developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings.

This statement sets out details of the preliminary consultation that has taken place which has informed the development and refinement of the draft Urban Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It provides details of who was consulted, how and when to inform the preparation of the SPD, what main issues were raised during the public consultation stage and how those issues have been addressed in the draft SPD.

2. Preliminary consultation

The council conducted a preliminary consultation exercise on a discussion paper between 8 December 2014 and 30 January 2015. Respondents were invited to answer ten questions, and an online questionnaire mirroring the questions posed in the discussion paper was also set up using Survey Monkey. This was accessible via the SPD webpage on the council's website.

The council targeted this public consultation to all of those individuals and organisations registered on planning policy consultation database (over 1700 registered). Where email addresses were not available, letters were sent.

In total, 22 responses were received; 15 written consultation responses and seven online questionnaire responses. These responses, and the council's response to them, are collated in the table in Appendix 1. A meeting with Islington amenity groups was also held, with the Islington Society, Amwell Society, Canonbury Society, DOCOMOMO and Upper Street Association in attendance, and the issues raised at this meeting have also been taken into account in the draft SPD.

3. Analysis of preliminary consultation responses

The 22 responses were received from a range of respondents. Detailed responses were received from: The Islington Society; English Heritage; Montagu Evans; Savills; and DOCOMOMO. There were 10 other, essentially single issue, responses, and seven local residents responded to the online survey. Responses, broadly speaking, fell into the following categories:

- The level of prescription perceived in the advice given.
- The precision of language used
- Resistance to gated development
- A desire to see greater emphasis on contemporary and alternative site layouts
- The importance of developments' environmental/thermal performance
- The economic realities of redevelopment/refurbishment/home/estate improvement
- The need for a relaxation of domestic design restrictions to meet burgeoning demand

4. Next Steps

This consultation statement will be updated following public consultation on the draft SPD. A full consultation statement detailing work undertaken and responses received at both preliminary consultation and full consultation stages will be published alongside the final Urban Design Guide SPD.

Appendix 1: Council response to written and online consultation responses to Discussion Paper and issues raised during public meetings

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
Written responses		
<p>Islington Society</p>	<p>We are not convinced that the revised SPD should be called the Islington Design Guide (para 2.6). ‘Design’ is a broad church covering areas not associated with the built environment, such as interior design of offices and reception areas and such as graphic design of leaflets and signage, amongst others. Islington <i>is</i> an urban area and the appendage ‘Urban’ seems appropriate to this guide to the quality of the built environment.</p> <p>We agree that the aim should be to avoid unnecessary <i>prescription</i>, so long as the <i>guidance</i> is clear and robust</p> <p>Section 3.3 Para 1. Remove the specific reference to ‘brick slips’ and replace with ‘thin brick cladding’.</p> <p>Remove prohibition on ‘metal cladding and rendered surfaces ...’. <i>Well designed and detailed</i> contemporary treatments and materials <i>might</i> be permitted.</p> <p>Para 2. Contradicts prohibition in para 1.</p> <p>Para 3. We entirely agree with the ‘tenure blind’ policy.</p> <p>Section 3.4 A distinction needs to be made between outbuildings ancillary to the residential use that are permitted under PD rights and Garden Rooms that need Planning Permission.</p> <p>Section 3.5 A ‘good proportion of the original garden’ is a bit vague and may need clarification.</p> <p>It should be made clear that ‘keeping something low’ doesn’t mean that sinking it or digging a basement.</p> <p>We don’t agree that a garden room <i>has</i> to be kept well away from a</p>	<p>The document will retain the title ‘Islington’s Urban Design Guide SPD’</p> <p>Guidance is based on achieving clear outcomes.</p> <p>Guidance on the use and detailing of particular materials has been updated in the draft SPD to improve clarity. There is a greater emphasis on detailing and workmanship in the revised draft.</p> <p>The guidance refers only to those developments that require planning permission; the distinction is made clear in the draft.</p> <p>Diagrams are provided to clarify the criteria set, whilst avoiding unnecessary prescription. There is an emphasis throughout on the importance of sustainable and inclusive design.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>boundary wall, if it doesn't involve raising the boundary wall in any harmful way. A shed tucked away at the bottom of a garden is often a good place for it, as is a building across the bottom of a garden.</p> <p>Section 3.6 We agree that a balance between reducing energy consumption and safeguarding the visual and historic environment is needed.</p> <p>Section 3.7 Para 3. We recommend that a requirement to demonstrate a positive energy reduction benefit is included in any application to permit them, especially in the case of Listed Buildings.</p> <p>Paras 4 & 5. In the case of existing buildings, there should be a presumption in favour of retaining existing. Decayed windows, both timber and metal, can be readily repaired, usually more cost effectively (cheaply) than replacement windows, retaining their embedded energy.</p> <p>Para 6, etc. We welcome the guidance demanding a justification of the use of uPVC windows.</p> <p>Sections 3.8 to 3.13 Para 3.11 Add "and damage to tree roots" after "vegetation in gardens".</p> <p>Section 3.14 We agree that it is sensible to incorporate the Shopfront Design Guide in this SPD.</p> <p>Section 4.2 We entirely support the presumption against gated communities. This applies equally to retro-fitting to existing residential developments. We specially deplore the Council's installation of defensive barriers to its own estates; examples are at Popham Street, N1 and Holbrooke Court, N7</p> <p>Section 4.3 In principle, we agree that such a revision appears sensible, but we await the revised guidance for comment.</p> <p>Section 4.4 In some Conservation Areas, too, there may be scope for revising the guidance for rear roof extensions by a clearer definition of 'long views' (as distinguished from 'distant views across gardens')</p>	<p>The guidance provided in the draft SPD balances the council's conservation, environmental and inclusive design priorities</p> <p>The Basement SPD (adopted January 2016) sets out comprehensive guidance on where and how subterranean development is acceptable.</p> <p>Support for strengthening guidance in respect to gated developments noted.</p> <p>This scope for a clearer definition of "long views" will be considered when the relevant Conservation Area Guidelines documents are</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>Section 4.9 The wording of the proposed guidance is good.</p> <p>Section 4.11 Remove “both above and below ground”, which is unnecessary and implies acceptance of subterranean developments.</p> <p>Remove “the street scene” (since by definition rear extensions are not on the street); add instead “adjacent and surrounding buildings”</p> <p>Section 4.13 Change “(overlooking and visual amenity)” in last line to “(visual amenity and overlooking, including gardens and their peaceful enjoyment)”</p>	<p>revised.</p> <p>The relevant guidance in the current draft refers to the impact on neighbouring properties. This is considered a sufficient and appropriate planning consideration.</p>
<p>Amwell Society</p>	<p>It may make sense to consider applications for two-storey, full-width rear extensions on their merits outside of conservation areas. We can see no benefit in encouraging such applications within conservation areas, where they are almost certain to be turned down.</p> <p>We are strongly opposed to gated developments, not only in the area surrounding Amwell Street, but throughout the Borough. We support your aim of strengthening the guidelines in this respect</p>	<p>Diagrams are provided to clarify where and how rear extensions may be acceptable.</p> <p>Support for strengthening guidance in respect to gated developments noted.</p>
<p>The Upper Street Association</p>	<p>We strongly support the Council’s decision to review the Guide.</p> <p>Welcome new firmer guidance on shop fronts.</p> <p>Agree firm guidance needed on materials to protect context and quality.</p> <p>Support suggested guidance on garden rooms</p> <p>Disagree with the relaxation of protection of designated protected rooflines</p> <p>Would like the amenity of neighbours’ expressly to be taken into account in any application for extensions.</p> <p>Context must be taken into account, and neighbours’ views and amenity re balconies and roof terraces.</p>	<p>General support noted.</p> <p>The revised guidance continues to protect unbroken roof lines in conservation areas but only unbroken front rooflines elsewhere. Proposals to alter rear rooflines will be permitted in principle but will be subject to the usual quality controls.</p> <p>The amenity of neighbouring properties is a key consideration in the guidance provided on the design and detailing of rear extensions and balconies/roof terraces.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
<p>The Canonbury Society</p>	<p>The current guide is useful because it is prescriptive – e.g. it comments on heights of extensions and the referencing of space between side extensions and the next door house.</p> <p>We don't agree that 'self-coloured' rendered surfaces are always preferable to painted cement or lime based render. In the Canonbury Conservation Area, there are a lot of houses whose lower and upper ground floors are front rendered and painted in this way. We don't believe this is particularly onerous in terms of maintenance and can look much more attractive than self-coloured surfaces.</p> <p>We welcome the tightening of policy on garden rooms</p> <p>The proposed guidance on basements is inadequate and insufficient. In particular, the proposed guidance does not include the point about gardens in paragraph 3.11</p> <p>We welcome the greater planning status afforded to shop front design.</p> <p>We welcome the slight tightening of policy on rear extensions.</p> <p>We support your three main considerations re balconies and terraces.</p>	<p>General support noted. However, an overly prescriptive approach is counter to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The draft SPD sets out clear criteria-based guidance.</p> <p>Guidance on the use and detailing of particular materials has been updated in the draft SPD to improve clarity. There is a greater emphasis on detailing and workmanship in the revised draft.</p> <p>The Basement SPD (adopted January 2016) this sets out comprehensive guidance on where and how subterranean development is acceptable.</p>
<p>English Heritage</p>	<p>English Heritage supports the creation of this document and we are generally of the view that it supports the Borough's Core Strategy Policy CS9.</p> <p>Materials - in the context of heritage assets "new materials should be appropriate to the significance of the heritage assets".</p> <p>What is meant by the test of "demonstrable value" in respect of external cladding?</p> <p>It is inappropriate to say that uPVC windows are unacceptable in the setting of heritage assets (re NPPF and PD rights). Suggest uPVC use is tested against the significance of heritage assets including their setting. See Climate Change and Your Home website www.climatechangeandyourhome.org.uk/live/</p>	<p>General support noted.</p> <p>Guidance on the use and detailing of particular materials has been updated in the draft SPD to improve clarity. There is a greater emphasis on detailing and workmanship in the revised draft.</p> <p>Guidance on the specification of replacement windows has been updated in the draft SPD to improve clarity.</p> <p>The Basement SPD (adopted January 2016) sets out comprehensive guidance on where and how subterranean development is acceptable, including in regard to listed buildings.</p> <p>Improved illustration has been a key objective in the production of the revised draft.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>Section 3.12 We would recommend that the following sentence is amended to read “The significance of listed buildings may include...that potential”. This better acknowledges the wider range of significance that may be present in a designated heritage asset and the possibility that the plan form in some instances may not be of significance.</p> <p>Basements – please add “the proposed development’s ability to conserve the historic interest of the building” ... This would ensure that in the case of an existing historic basement any features of historic interest would be conserved or enhanced.</p> <p>We support the inclusion of the shop front design guidance.</p> <p>Guidance on the design and construction of rooflines not covered by a designation is welcome.</p> <p>Good practice/implementation illustrations should include examples of historic building</p> <p>Reference should be made to the Building Heights Planning Advice Note.</p>	
Canal and River Trust	The guide should promote the use of the canal for heating and cooling canal side development	This is outside the scope of the SPD.
Local resident	The eighteenth and nineteenth century conception was that the roofs and the dormers within them were subservient to the grand architectural composition of the public, set-piece, uniform composition of Georgian houses in terraces. In terraces like those in Islington, Lambeth, Southwark, Hackney etc. dormers, where there were any, were <i>informal</i> elements and generally <i>mismatched</i> the formal arrangement and regular composition of the houses below. They were regarded as utilitarian illumination of the service rooms located in the attic. English Heritage’s December 1989 “Mansard Roofs” guide illustrates seven examples.	It is understood that historically windows to mansards were often off centre in relation to the windows to the main elevation. However, it would be difficult to demonstrate harm from windows aligned with windows to the main elevation.
Montagu Evans	Character can vary greatly across a borough such as Islington and it is necessary to have a degree of flexibility in policies so that the local	

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>character and distinctiveness can be responded to.</p> <p>In other words, we do not see the ability for there to be varying interpretations of design parameters to be necessarily negative as it can facilitate architects' and designers' creativity and ultimately result in better design.</p> <p>Materials – It is not clear what is meant by 'authentic'.</p> <p>Guidance should be positive - requesting that justification be given for the use of particular materials because the acceptability or otherwise of any material will depend on a variety of factors such as local context, the design rationale for the proposal, the type of building, use and energy-efficiency considerations.</p> <p>Garden rooms – 'a good proportion' is not an objective measure.</p> <p>Energy saving - there should be a clearer indication of how the sometimes-competing aims of the relevant 'parent' policies will be balanced against each other</p> <p>The proposed guidance states that alternatives to replacement windows will be encouraged, particularly in conservation areas. This ignores continued improvements in technology which may make replacement windows more appropriate. Conservation area designation should not be an impediment to their use.</p> <p>Gated communities – if the Council is to prescribe a set of layout considerations to which developers will have to pay regard then they must be consulted on</p> <p>Roof extensions - it should be acceptable to restore features such as dormer windows and roof lights on heritage assets even if they have been previously completely removed.</p> <p>Rear extensions – Do these provisions apply only to terraced houses or to all properties. If the latter then the guidance is over-restrictive.</p> <p>Balconies – The guidance that these should be integral to the building's</p>	<p>The section on Islington's character and distinctiveness has been significantly enhanced to account for recent development trends including social and economic factors.</p> <p>An overly prescriptive approach is counter to the NPPF. The draft SPD therefore sets out clear criteria-based guidance. The guidance provided balances the council's conservation, environmental and inclusive design priorities.</p> <p>Guidance on the use and detailing of particular materials has been updated in the draft SPD to improve clarity. There is a greater emphasis on detailing and workmanship in the revised draft.</p> <p>Guidance on the specification of replacement windows has been updated in the draft SPD to improve clarity.</p> <p>Guidance on the delivery of permeable development has been strengthened in the revised draft to clarify the approach to site layout and street design.</p> <p>Diagrams are provided to clarify where and how rear extensions and roof extensions may be acceptable.</p> <p>The guidance for the design of balconies and roof terraces is rooted in existing planning policies including those that seek to enhance the sustainability and accessibility of the built environment.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	structure rather than hung off its elevation is unjustifiably prescriptive. And guidance that they should not compromise the thermal performance or accessibility of the facility is dealt with by building control.	
Local resident	All restrictions on rooflines should be removed and all roof extensions should be assessed on merit	A case by case approach to assessing applications without clear guidance would not address the cumulative impacts of such development in a clear, equitable or consistent manner, and therefore is not a reasonable approach that would support delivery of policy objectives and prevent unacceptable impacts. In the interest of preserving the quality and amenity of borough's conservation areas, restriction is necessary.
Local resident	Resistance to gated communities should be strengthened. Dormers should be set within the roof plane.	Diagrams are provided, clarifying the criteria to be met when proposing roof extensions and dormer windows.
Local resident	All restrictions on rooflines should be removed and all roof extensions should be assessed on merit	A case by case approach to assessing applications without clear guidance would not address the cumulative impacts of such development in a clear, equitable or consistent manner, and therefore is not a reasonable approach that would support delivery of policy objectives and prevent unacceptable impacts. In the interest of preserving the quality and amenity of borough's conservation areas, restriction is necessary.
Savills on behalf of Ashburton Trading, Islington Holdings Ltd, and Parkhurst Road Ltd	<p>There is a need for the Council to thoroughly review the guidance in light of the new policy and guidance context, and to consider whether the SPD can be withdrawn altogether.</p> <p>If the guidance is to remain it must be sufficiently flexible to allow urban design to respond to changing circumstances and site specific circumstances.</p> <p>Our primary concern relates to the intended revisions in relation to materials.</p> <p>It is proposed that 'metal cladding, large areas of glazed curtain walling, and concrete or rendered surfaces' are unlikely to be acceptable'. However, the adopted Urban Design Guidance (2006) shows examples</p>	<p>The guidance provided is rooted in existing planning policies and provides clear criteria to enable developers to make successful applications.</p> <p>An overly prescriptive approach is counter to the NPPF. The draft SPD therefore sets out clear criteria-based guidance. The guidance provided balances the council's conservation, environmental and inclusive design priorities.</p> <p>The revised draft balances a concern for the borough's existing fabric with an appreciation of and vision for contemporary/future development.</p> <p>Guidance on the use and detailing of particular materials has been</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>of buildings that are clearly contemporary in design and use contemporary materials that reflect the construction used.</p> <p>Unless a conservation area appraisal specifically highlights brick as a characteristic of the area and thus its special character it is not appropriate to impose the use of materials generally across the borough</p> <p>The proposed wording is overly prescriptive, and fails to acknowledge the boroughs successful contemporary buildings, Finsbury Health Centre, Angel Building, City University School of Social Sciences, City and Islington College, St Mary Magdalene Academy and The Emirates Stadium and associated buildings.</p> <p>The emphasis must be on quality of materials and details.</p>	<p>updated in the draft SPD to improve clarity. There is a greater emphasis on detailing and workmanship in the revised draft.</p> <p>The section on Islington's character and distinctiveness has been significantly enhanced to account for recent development trends, including social and economic factors.</p>
DOCOMOMO	<p>I have strong reservations about the prescriptive approach and apparent certainty about what is good and bad in design in many areas of the Guide.</p> <p>The hostility of the Guide to incidental open spaces or open spaces on housing estates. This attitude has contributed to the loss of such spaces which have been a critical benefit -derived from a Modern Movement approach to design - which was subsequently lost by in-filling.</p> <p>The Borough has a substantial heritage of Modern Movement buildings by Tecton and successor practices, two of which are specifically criticised in the current UDG. Islington has a significant amount of Modern Movement development of quality, such as King Square, which is roundly criticised in para 2.2.5 of Section 2, and compared unfavourably to Highbury Fields. King Square is a dramatic composition which derives its drama from the contrasts of scale and provides a much increased amount of open space as compared to the former King Square central garden - a wonderful asset, even if the architecture itself is not of highest quality.</p> <p>The Modern Movement sought to get away from perimeter planning for</p>	<p>Concern noted. An overly prescriptive approach is counter to the NPPF. The draft SPD therefore sets out clear criteria-based guidance.</p> <p>Guidance on the preservation and enhancement of genuine greenspace has been strengthened in the revised draft.</p> <p>The section on Islington's character and distinctiveness has been significantly enhanced to account for recent development trends, including social and economic factors, and also to better articulate the objectives which various design approaches sought to archive. A best practice example has also been provided to demonstrate sensitive infill on a post-war housing estate that improves the quality of the open space.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>various reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The technical facility to build taller would result in dark/ canyon-like streets ... streets and courtyards would have to be much wider in order to compensate • Corridor streets are noisy and polluted – buildings need to withdraw from them. • A more spatially varied urban landscape is possible and preferable to the ‘endless spread of corridor streets’. • the ability to build taller facilitated the creation of more spacious layouts with greener space around each building and with lighter sunnier accommodation with a better view than was possible with ground-hugging 2-3 storey terrace housing.. <p>E.g. the Barnsbury Estate where the blocks are set back from the street and provide ‘ample green space, as compared to the rather dismal internal yards of the pre-war parts of the estate. These areas are not designated as public open space and so are vulnerable to development.</p> <p>E.g the Copenhagen Street frontage of the Barnsbury Estate and the courtyard between and green strip frontage to the ‘two-towers’ on Pentonville Road.</p> <p>The ‘Modern Movement’ approach can be disruptive when inserted into an established and coherent historic ‘perimeter’ area but the UDG also calls for the re-creation of it e.g. the streets in Isledon Village do not look very lively but rather lacking in greenery. The proposed layout for the Market Estate shows perimeter blocks ‘with a vengeance’, where only a small proportion of the flats to be built will look out over the green space and the remainder into narrow almost treeless streets or lifeless internal courtyards, and the ‘twin-fronted block’ illustrated on page 84 has always seemed to me absolutely deplorable - a cheap piece of building with vulgar anodised finishes and monotonous facades that fills its site completely with no shred of a concession to open space or greenery.</p> <p>The green space on the existing Market Estate (Page 86) with a cross as being undesirable looks to me rather attractive.</p>	<p>Guidance on the delivery of permeable development has been strengthened in the revised draft to clarify the approach to site layout and street design to ensure that new developments are permeable, safe and inclusive as well as providing for sufficient light and air to penetrate the buildings, surrounding streets and any open space, and an appropriate height: width ratio between the building frontage and the street.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>At 250 City Road, we will get a 9-storey perimeter block around an inadequately small and overshadowed green space, with canyon-streets beyond, and with further 31-storey towers on top of that - disastrous for the urban environment all round and probably for the occupants....In this context the 'perimeter block' model is no longer viable or desirable...I cannot see how the IUDG policies could be applied to such a scheme at all, certainly none are shown.</p> <p>The old Perimeter Block model cannot and does not always meet the needs and pressures of the 21st century city.... the Urban Design Guide should show greater recognition of the merits and potential of the alternatives - of the Modern or Spatial City.</p>	
Local Resident	<p>Mansard roof extensions should be viewed more positively. Many families would much rather add a mansard to increase space (than move).</p> <p>The current requirement does not seem to make much sense because some streets are wider than others, so where all mansards in the Arlington area are visible, in St Peter's they are nearly always invisible.</p> <p>Mansards, in the view of some, enhance the style of buildings (and have been used in Britain since the 17th century), streets would look better with consistent mansards than they look today, given the inconsistency of previous consents.</p> <p>The design standard should enable mansards to be built with sufficient interior ceiling height so that the new accommodation is proportionate and comfortable. It is nonsensical to require, on grounds of exterior visibility, respecting such a low ridge-line that either one has to walk about stooped, or reduce the ceiling height of the rooms below</p>	Noted. Diagrams are provided, clarifying the criteria to be met when proposing roof extensions and dormer windows.
Survey Monkey		
7 respondents – all local residents	<p><i>Q1: Is the proposed guidance on the specification of materials adequate and sufficient?</i></p> <p>43% yes 57% no</p>	Guidance on the use and detailing of particular materials has been updated in the draft SPD to improve clarity. There is a greater emphasis on detailing and workmanship in the revised draft.

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>“Assuming only the section in bold is the new guidance, the terms used - authentic, high quality, robust, and sustainable are all very subjective and need a considerable amount of clarification to define what they mean. Specific examples should be set out. All materials can be done well or badly with the final result depending on the overall design and detailing. Even high quality e.g. expensive bricks can look terrible if the overall design is poor.”</p> <p>“The guidance on materials is not well informed. The presumption in favour of self-coloured renders is inappropriate and cannot be justified. Self-coloured renders age badly and attract atmospheric pollution giving facades a tired and dirty appearance soon after construction. There are many examples of this across Islington (see for example the N1 centre). Mineral/cement-based (and painted renders) retain their appearance much longer and can be maintained cheaply and easily by redecorating. Using mineral paints (rather than acrylic paints) on cement renders can extend a fresh and clean visual appearance of facades for many years. The presumption against metal cladding is too strong. Metal ages well, generally integrates well with a historic built context and performs very well as a component in contemporary sustainable construction systems. The presumption against exposed concrete is out-dated and should be removed. Some of London's most notable and innovative buildings – many of them now listed - feature exposed concrete surfaces”</p>	
	<p><i>Q2: Is the proposed guidance on the scale and quality of garden rooms adequate and sufficient?</i></p> <p>71% yes 29% no</p> <p>“clarity on what reasonable distances are and low height are required”</p> <p>“it should stress absolutely and categorically that garden rooms are NOT acceptable, unless severe reason is shown why it was needed. Then the remainder of the text in 3.5 can stand”</p>	<p>Diagrams are provided to demonstrate what might be considered reasonable.</p> <p>Garden rooms that occupy less than 50% of the garden and are less than 2.5m high are permitted development anywhere within the site boundary of a single dwelling house.</p>
	<p><i>Q3: Is the proposed guidance on the installation of energy saving measures adequate and sufficient?</i></p>	<p>Noted. An example has been provided.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>71% yes 29% no</p> <p>“examples of successful over-cladding and retrofit works would be very helpful”</p> <p>“The guidance on windows is good.”</p> <p>“Double glazing is the only thing that produces a significant reduction in energy consumption and should be permitted (with sensible exceptions for listed buildings).</p>	
	<p><i>Q4: Is the proposed guidance on the excavation of basements adequate and sufficient?</i></p> <p>71% yes 29% no</p> <p>“build times for basement extensions should be limited to 3 months, a has huge effect on neighbours”</p> <p>“The guidance on basements is adequate”</p> <p>“The issue of significance for listed buildings could be expanded on further”</p> <p>“It should be mentioned, that - under no circumstances - should trees be felled, roots cut off or gardens amended to enable the works to take place. It should be made as undesirable as possible to even consider basement extensions”.</p>	<p>The Basement SPD (adopted January 2016) sets out comprehensive guidance on where and how subterranean development is acceptable, including in relation to listed buildings and impact on trees.</p>
	<p><i>Q5: Is the proposal to incorporate the council’s guidance on the design of new and refurbished shop fronts within a revised IUDG SPD acceptable?</i></p> <p>100% yes</p>	
	<p><i>Q6: Are the designated protected rooflines adequate and sufficient?</i></p>	<p>Diagrams are provided on the acceptable configuration of mansard and other roof extensions.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>50% yes 50% no</p> <p><i>Q7: Is the proposed guidance on the design and construction of roof extensions adequate and sufficient?</i></p> <p>17% yes 83% no</p> <p>“full mansard extensions in keeping with traditional construction methods and window layouts should be approved automatically. The current policy of ‘set back extensions’ creates a mish-mash of compromised construction and reduces the habitable floor area of the borough. An approved design would create continuity and additional floor space that would benefit growing families in particular”</p> <p>“full width box extensions should be banned. This part of the guide will arguably have most potential impact on the urban scene, albeit mainly on the rear of terraces. As many examples good and bad should be provided to try and improve design quality and provide a reasonable extension without irreparably damaging the integrity of a building.”</p> <p>“London is experiencing unprecedented growth and a significant proportion of Islington residents are overcrowded. This impacts the well-being of a new generation of children growing up in Islington. In reality buildings are not perceived in elevation. Where roof extensions are carefully proportioned, set-back and of high quality design they are one of the most sustainable forms of development capable of providing additional living space with minimal impact on the townscape. Indeed, many of Islington's most elegant squares and streets have seen additional floors/roof extensions added during the 19th Century and these have become a regular feature in conservation areas. The guidance as proposed is still too restrictive. With much of Islington's housing in conservation areas, a pragmatic approach should be taken allowing roof extensions across Islington (except for listed buildings) whilst carefully controlling the design, proportions, materiality and arrangement in relation to the existing building. Haringey, Hammersmith and other London Councils are recognizing the pressure on residential space and are embracing the opportunities brought about by a pro-active and positive attitude towards roof extensions”</p>	<p>The revised guidance continues to protect unbroken roof lines in conservation areas but only unbroken front rooflines elsewhere. Proposals to alter rear rooflines will be permitted in principle but will be subject to the usual quality controls.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p>“it’s all a little too late. The damage is already being done.”</p> <p>“Mansard roof extensions should be relaxed. The reality of pressures on housing means they are increasingly necessary. Especially for two/three storey terraces an extension can make them a true family home. The council could provide a number of approved frontage designs that home owners would have to stick to so that uniformity is protected.”</p>	
	<p><i>Q8: Is the proposed guidance on the design and construction of rear extensions adequate and sufficient?</i></p> <p>29% yes 71% no</p> <p>“properties on the border of hackney should have more relaxed planning as hackney seems to have absolutely no consideration for their wellbeing and outlook”</p> <p>“What would typically constitute a "good proportion" of rear garden space?”</p> <p>“slightly larger extensions could be allowed if the design quality is good enough and as many examples of this as possible should be provided”</p> <p>“We benefit from a varied and diverse building stock in Islington. Favours rear extensions on the staircase side of a terraced building limits the potential for the design to recognize the restrictions and opportunities of each specific typology and site. Greater harm can be caused by prescribing the position of extensions rather than by judging the merit of individual proposals”</p> <p>“It should be made as undesirable as possible, with the introduction: "Rear extensions are only approved in extremely rare circumstances”</p> <p>“You should consider relaxing constraints on building extra levels on rear stacks.”</p>	<p>Diagrams are provided to clarify where and how rear extensions may be acceptable.</p> <p>An overly prescriptive approach is counter to the NPPF. The draft SPD sets out clear criteria-based guidance, and each proposal is assessed contextually with reference to these criteria.</p>

RESPONDENT	SUMMARY OF RESPONSE	RESPONSE FROM COUNCIL
	<p><i>Q9: Is the proposed guidance on the design and construction of balconies and roof terraces adequate and sufficient?</i></p> <p>67% yes 33% no</p> <p>“expand on thermal performance and accessibility”</p> <p>“Projecting balconies maximise site-yield, positively animate facades and maximise self-policing of public spaces. Projecting balconies also enhance the amenity of the outside space created compared to inset balconies. There are myriad examples of award-winning contemporary buildings in London where projecting balconies positively enhance the street scene. A general presumption against projecting balconies is not justifiable and the requirement to integrate balconies in the building structure should be omitted”</p> <p>“Again, it needs to be made a difficult as possible to approve balconies and roof terraces, as noise restrictions and those governing light pollution would not be enforceable”</p>	<p>Criteria for accessibility and thermal performance are set out in the revised draft.</p> <p>An overly prescriptive approach is counter to the NPPF. The draft SPD sets out clear criteria-based guidance, and each proposal is assessed contextually with reference to these criteria.</p> <p>Such an approach would run counter to enabling principle of national policy direction.</p>
	<p><i>Q10: Are there any further changes to the guidance provided by the Islington Urban Design Guide would you like to see?</i></p> <p>“The requirement for new homes to provide dual aspect (CS9 – F) is desirable, but not achievable on many constrained sites in Islington. To maximise site yield smaller units should be exempt from having to be double aspect and site constraints should be taken into account where new homes are provided as change of use and/or infill development.”</p> <p>“It should be made as unattractive as possible and very, very expensive to undertake any work to modify existing buildings or landscapes, especially with the "Right to build". Also, noise and environmental protection impacts need to be carefully studied.”</p>	<p>In the interests of natural ventilation, the requirement that all new dwellings are dual aspect is an adopted Core Strategy and Development Management Policy. An SPD cannot change adopted development plan policies.</p> <p>An overly prescriptive approach is counter to the NPPF. The draft SPD sets out clear criteria-based guidance, and each proposal is assessed contextually with reference to these criteria.</p>