



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 April 2025

by **D Cleary MTCP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 May 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210W/25/3358785

156 Royal College Street, Camden, London NW1 0TA

- 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 P Koumourou against the decision of the London Borough of Camden Council.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1988/P.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of single storey rear extension at first floor level
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension at first floor level at 156 Royal College Street, Camden, London NW1 0TA in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2024/1988/P, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans referenced RCS/24/P/01 – Existing Photographs + Site Location Plan; and, RCS/22/P/02 – Existing Plans and Elevations.
 - 3) Before the use of any external facing material of the extension hereby approved, the following shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - a) Details, including sections at 1:10, of all windows (including jambs, head and cill)
 - b) Plan, elevation and section drawings, including fascia, cornice, and glazing panels at a scale of 1:10
 - c) Manufacturer's specification details of all facing materials, including colour finishThe development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) Prior to the construction of the roof of the extension hereby permitted, full details of the living roof areas on the ground and first floor extensions shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority. The details shall include:
 - a) a detailed scheme of maintenance
 - b) sections at a scale of 1:20 with manufacturers details demonstrating the construction and materials used

- c) full details of planting species and density

The living roofs shall be fully provided in accordance with the approved details prior to first occupation and shall thereafter be retained and maintained in accordance with the approved scheme.

- 5) The flat roofs on the ground and first floor extensions shall not be used as roof terraces and should only be accessed for the purpose of maintenance.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner above, and in my formal decision, I have used the description of development as detailed on the decision notice of the Council rather than that which is on the application form. This is because it more accurately describes the development proposed.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Camden Broadway Conservation Area (the CBCA).

Reasons

4. The appeal site relates to a mid-terraced property constructed from yellow brick. The front elevation comprises a ground floor shop front with arched window detailing at first floor level and square openings at second floor, with parapet roof above. The rear elevation is constructed from brickwork with dark grey hanging tiles at second floor level.
5. It is understood that planning permission has been granted to convert the building into flats with accommodation provided over 5-storeys¹. A roof extension, and extensions at both lower and upper ground floor levels have been approved and, at the time of my site visit, these were under construction. The site is located within a row of terraced properties. No.154 Royal College Street (No.154), lies adjacent, and is of similar scale, form and appearance to the appeal site. On the other side, Nos.158-164 Royal College Street (Nos.158-164) appears to be of more recent construction. Nos.158-164 are much larger than the appeal building, with a greater degree of rearward projection. The wider surrounding area is generally mixed in character with a high degree of commercial premises at ground floor level with residential occupying the upper levels.
6. The site lies within the CBCA which is a small Conservation Area which is focussed around the intersection of Camden Road and Royal College Street. The statutory requirement² requires that special attention be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. The Camden Broadway Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Plan 2009 (the CACAMP) provides a good understanding of the CBCA, detailing its historic origins and development through time, while identifying the characteristics and features of importance that it possesses. Insofar as is relevant to this appeal the significance of

¹ 2022/2112/P

² Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

the CBCA derives from the historic origins and development of the area, along with the architectural quality and detailing of its buildings.

7. The CACAMP³ identifies the appeal site and No.154 as being buildings which make a positive contribution to the CBCA. The CACAMP indicates that this is due to the uniformity of the building type, and strong cohesive identity. The CACAMP identifies that the traditional shop fronts of these buildings are also of townscape merit⁴. In my opinion, I find that it is the quality of the front façade of these buildings which provides a positive contribution to the overall character and appearance of the CBCA.
8. The proposed first floor extension to the rear would not project as far as the upper ground floor extension. It would also be set in slightly from the side boundary with No.154. Its flat roof design and overall height would be set below the original eaves of the building. I find that the proportions of the extension, in isolation, would result in a relatively modest addition to the building. The lower and upper ground floor extensions each have a greater degree of rearward projection and are also full width. Each respective level would have a lesser degree of projection and extent of overall mass. The design of the approved and proposed extensions, would ensure that the extent of built form over each level is sequentially reduced. This would provide a sense of visual hierarchy in the additions to the rear elevation. As such the rear elevation would not be visually overwhelmed by the additions.
9. While the rear façade is visible from Baynes Street the appeal building is set away from the street. Furthermore, the rear façade is viewed in the context of the much larger and imposing built form of Nos.158-164. This building lies immediately adjacent to the appeal site, and has a significantly greater bulk and degree of rearward projection. The proposed extension would be set against this larger development and, due to its modest proportions and limited height, it would appear subservient in scale. As such, No.158-164 would remain dominant in views from Baynes Street with the proposed extension compactly sited against its mass. Therefore, I do not consider that the scale of the extension in isolation, or cumulatively with other extensions, would appear as a bulky or incongruous addition in views from Baynes Street.
10. The use of zinc facing materials would introduce a non-traditional material to the building. Nonetheless, the relatively modest scale of the extension would ensure that the use of zinc would not be a predominant facing material on the building. Furthermore, as identified above, the distance from Baynes Street along with the backdrop of No.158-164 would ensure that the extension would not be prominently sited. Importantly, the colour finish to the zinc could be controlled by condition. A colour which is similar to the dark grey hanging roof tiles, which would be positioned above the extension, would also ensure that the materials could visually assimilate with the existing building.
11. The proposed extension would not erode features of significance in the CBCA, and on this building, I consider this principally relates to its front façade. While I do not consider that the character or appearance of the CBCA would be enhanced by the

³ Appendix 2

⁴ Appendix 4

proposed development, I do find that the scale and siting of the extension would ensure that it would be preserved.

12. For the above reasons, I conclude that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the CBCA. Therefore, the development complies with Policies D1 and D2 Camden Local Plan 2017 (the LP). Together, amongst other things these seek to ensure that development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

Other matters

13. I note the comments raised by third parties with regard to design, the loss of an approved skylight and green roof, the use of the flat roof, and noise during construction. Matters relating to design have been considered under the main issue. With regard to the loss of green roof and the use of the flat roof as a terrace, these are issues which the Council consider can be controlled via condition, and I return to this below. I note that the scheme would result in the loss of a skylight serving a room in the upper ground floor. However, from the evidence before me, the room below appears as though it would be served by a large opening in the rear elevation and the Council have raised no concern in this regard. Therefore, I have no evidence to persuade me that the internal living environment would be substandard. Finally, with regard to noise during construction, this would be a matter for the Council to investigate and, if necessary, take action.

Conditions

14. I have imposed standard conditions relating to the commencement of development, and to require compliance with the submitted plans for certainty. A condition requiring the final facing materials of the extension to be submitted for approval is necessary in the interests of the main issue. It would be necessary to restrict access to the flat roof for maintenance only as any domestic use may give rise to unacceptable overlooking or noise disturbance to the occupants of adjacent properties. The scheme would result in the partial loss of a previously approved green roof. There is an opportunity to compensate for this loss on the flat roof of the extension. A condition for a green roof is therefore necessary in the interest of adapting to climate change, and in accordance with Policy CC2 of the LP.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D Cleary

INSPECTOR