
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2014

by Peter Rose BA MRTPI DMS MCMi

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

Decision date: 12 February 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/13/2210120
6 Mornington Terrace, London NW1 7RR

- 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 Mr Matt Hollier against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2013/4565/P, dated 18 July 2013, was refused by notice dated 24 October 2013.
 - The development proposed is rear extension at lower ground, ground and first floor level. Basement to form part of dwelling above, loss of existing self contained 1 bedroom basement flat. Replacement of lower ground windows to front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for rear extension at lower ground, ground and first floor level, basement to form part of dwelling above, loss of existing self contained 1 bedroom basement flat, and replacement of lower ground windows to front elevation at 6 Mornington Terrace, London NW1 7RR, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2013/4565/P, dated 18 July 2013, and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 109/PL/101, 109/PL/102, 109/PL/201/A, 109/PL/301/A, and 109/PL/302/A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension and in all other external works hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building unless otherwise specified on the approved drawings.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear extension upon the character and appearance of the host building, of the terrace, and of the Camden Town Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a 5-storey mid-terrace residential property including basement within the Camden Town Conservation Area. The footprint of the adjoining property at No 7 is set further back within its plot relative to the appeal site such that the flank wall of that property extends beyond that of the

host property to the rear. The flank wall to No 7 has been further developed with the addition of a large rear extension. The combined effect of the extended flank wall, the recessed footprint to No 7 and an existing half-width rear addition within the host property adjacent to No 5 is to create a relatively enclosed void to the rear of the host building. This void does not appear to be typical of other adjacent properties and is proposed to be significantly enclosed by the extension.

4. The rear of the host property includes a small garden and backs on to other rear gardens, including those of a parallel adjacent terrace, the rear of which overlooks the rear of the host terrace. The rear of nearby properties and their gardens are of varying forms and designs and include various extensions and other alterations, thereby creating a very mixed overall character and appearance. This includes a glazed roof extension to the rear of No 7. Whilst visible from overlooking properties and glimpsed from Albert Street, the rear of the host property otherwise offers no significant public views.
5. The proposed extension would be of a light, modern design and of a transparent form with minimal glazing frames. It would be set within the rear void such that its design and position would be reasonably related to the existing rear elevation. The relatively small footprint and limited height would create a sympathetic scale of development, helping to ensure that the structure would appear as a subservient feature to the main building.
6. This relationship would be reinforced by the pitched roof and slate tiles and would be combined with a wider scheme of improvement works generally in-keeping with the original character and appearance of the property. These works would include making good using traditional materials such as stock bricks, a new sash window, and removal of an existing roof terrace. Whilst the Council previously raised a concern regarding the pitch of the slate roof, I do not consider that aspect of the design would be harmful.
7. The Council maintains that the development would be contrary to the Camden Planning Guidance Design (CPG1). The Council suggests CPG1 seeks to resist the erection of 2-storey extensions or more, but I note that CPG1 advises that rear extensions should respect the pattern of existing buildings and that extensions higher than one full storey below roof level will be discouraged. It also states that the mass and bulk of high extensions may be compensated by a smaller footprint, and that extensions should be designed as secondary features, should respect original design and proportions, and should retain the open character of the area. I further note the advice set out in the Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (the Appraisal and Management Strategy) which states that modern design can successfully enhance the Conservation Area by carefully assessing and responding to the form and qualities of surrounding buildings and spaces.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed rear extension would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the host building or of the terrace, and would not fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. Accordingly, the extension would not be contrary to Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025, November 2010, would not be contrary to Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Development Policies, or to CPG1, or to the Appraisal and Management Strategy. These seek to ensure that development preserves and enhances the Borough's heritage and achieves

high quality design which respects local character, setting and context. The development would also be consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework which recognises that heritage assets such as Conservation Areas are an irreplaceable resource and requires them to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Other Matters

9. I noted at my visit that the rear rooms of the host site are relatively dark on account of their position relative to the flank wall of No 7, and have further noted the representations of Camden Town CAAG in this regard.
10. The Council raises no objection to the conversion of the property into a single house, or to the various other external works accompanying the extension. The Council considers the works would not harm the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, and I agree.
11. Disturbance and other possible inconvenience arising from the construction works has been raised. This would inevitably be a concern during the construction phase, but such matters are common to all construction work and cannot be taken as reason to dismiss the appeal.

Conditions

12. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council having regard to Circular 11/95. For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning, a condition is imposed to ensure the development is undertaken in accordance with the relevant drawings.
13. The Council suggests conditions to require submission of further detailed drawings or samples of materials in respect of glazing and roofing. Significant detail is already contained within the submitted drawings in these respects and, given the context of the rear of the site, such further details do not appear to be either necessary or reasonable. A condition is necessary, however, to ensure the external materials of the development match those of the host dwelling so as to achieve an acceptable overall standard of external appearance.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, and with regard to all other matters raised, I conclude the appeal should be allowed.

Peter Rose

INSPECTOR