



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 March 2023

by **P Eggleton BSc(Hons) MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24th April 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/22/3313523

197 Prince of Wales Road, Camden, London, NW5 3QB

- 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 Mrs V Thangavelu against the decision of the London Borough of Camden Council.
 - The application Ref 2022/3523/P, dated 16 August 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is a mansard roof extension with dormer windows to front and rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

3. The existing dwelling forms part of the locally listed terrace, 181-199 Prince of Wales Road, which is of architectural and townscape significance. Although the detailing of some properties within this terrace differ or have been lost; and the roof heights are slightly staggered to follow the levels of the road, they do provide a cohesive group with a generally consistent form and detail, topped by their similar parapets. The adjacent end terrace property, number 199, includes a roof extension behind the parapet, which is clearly at odds with the general form of the roofs of these terraced properties.
 4. In the wider area, the north side of the road, opposite the appeal property, includes a variety of building styles with little uniformity until much further to the east where similar properties to the appeal property can be found. On the south side, there is uniformity in form and design, despite differing ages of buildings. This includes the similar listed terrace at 131-149 and locally listed terrace at 169-179. The parapet roofs, which generally form the main upper features of these buildings, with only a very small number of discernible roof additions, contribute positively to the distinctive character and appearance of these terraces and the overall character of this side of the road.
 5. The proposed mansard, although of a design that would reflect the fenestration below, would consolidate and increase the scale of development that would
-

extend above the parapet wall. Given the width of this road and the proximity of Queens Crescent, which provides longer views, additions to the roofs within this terrace would be clearly visible and relatively prominent. This is demonstrated by the existing structure at number 199. The relatively unbroken parapet of this and nearby terraces are key feature of the appearance of this area.

6. Increasing the scale of roof top development associated with that at number 199 would increase the prominence of development above the parapet. Given that the parapet is not of sufficient height to screen such an addition, it would detract from the original character of the terrace and be at odds with the wider context. It would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of this building within the wider terrace and the overall street scene. Whilst mansard roof extensions are suited to some buildings, the limited height of this building and its low parapet, together with the wide range of easily accessible views of the structure above the parapet, does not suggest that this particular property is suited to such an addition. The proposal does not therefore represent high quality design in this particular context and would result in harm to the character and appearance of this area. It would also result in harm to this terrace as a non-designated heritage asset.
7. The proposal would conflict with policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 as it would not represent high quality design in this context and would not respect local context and character. As this policy generally accords with the design aspirations of the National Planning Policy Framework, I afford it considerable weight.
8. The Framework also advises that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account when determining an application and that a balanced judgement be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. The proposal would result in significant harm to this terrace in itself and in combination with the neighbouring development. The works would have benefits for the appellant and would also result in beneficial economic activity. When taken together, the weight of these benefits would not outweigh the harm to the important characteristics of this terrace of buildings.
9. A number of other matters have been put forward by the appellant. I do not agree that the proposal would be virtually invisible from ground level or would set a suitable design precedent that would ensure future development would be acceptable in this context. Other developments have been referred to and some photographs provided. Each application must be considered on its own merits. The range of locations and developments presented does not suggest clear similarities with this proposal. The most relevant relate to the existing development at number 199 and the dismissed appeal for a similar proposal at number 177.
10. Although the presence of the neighbouring roof extension, with regard to this appeal, means that the circumstances differ to some extent; and the development plan has been updated, there is nothing in the submissions made to suggest that a different conclusion to that of the Inspector considering the appeal at number 177 (APP/X5210/W/15/3103305) should be reached. With regard to the existing extension, the council identify that it was approved in

1971, significantly predating both the current development plan and the Framework. The weight I afford that decision is therefore limited although I have had regard to its physical presence when assessing this proposal.

11. In conclusion, the development would detract from the character and appearance of the area and from the terrace as a non-designated heritage asset. The matters put forward in support of the proposal do not outweigh these concerns. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR