



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 5 February 2013

by Ava Wood Dip Arch MRTPI

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

Decision date: 15 February 2013

Appeal A Ref: APP/X5210/E/12/2177382

3 Leigh Street, London WC1H 9EW

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mike Armstrong against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref:2012/0188/L, dated 19 December 2011, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2012.
 - The works proposed are replacement of rooftop stair enclosure with glazed aluminium framed structure.
-

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/12/2177381

3 Leigh Street, London WC1H 9EW

- 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 Mike Armstrong against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref: 2011/6371/P, dated 19 December 2011, was refused by notice dated 14 March 2012.
 - The development proposed is replacement of rooftop stair enclosure with glazed aluminium framed structure.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are allowed in the terms described in the appended schedules.

Procedural Matter

2. Policy CS14 of the Council's Core Strategy¹ expects development to be of the highest standard of design, and have respect for local context and character. Policy DP24 of the Development Policies document² is similarly concerned with securing high quality design, while Policy DP5 sets out the requirements for proposals to preserve and enhance conservation areas and not harm the special interest of listed buildings. These policies are largely consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) aims of achieving high standards of design and safeguarding the historic environment. I give them significant weight in accordance with paragraph 124 of the Framework.

¹ London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy

² London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies

Main Issues

3. The first main issue common to both appeals is whether the proposal would preserve the special architectural interest of the appeal building and group of three terraced houses of which it is a part (all listed as Grade II). The second issue is the effect it would have on the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Reasons

Listed Building Issue

4. The Council raises no objections to the works proposed for the interior of the building and I see no reason to disagree. What follows is a consideration of the impact of the extension at roof level.
5. The drawings show the proposed replacement structure would measure 3.5m in width with a depth of 2.63m and a lean-to roof extending to a height of 2.5m. In contrast to the existing stair enclosure (2.1m x 1.6m and a maximum height of 2.28m) the proposal would appear larger, and with the amount of glazing proposed would represent a more elaborate feature than the one to be replaced.
6. On the other hand, the contemporary design would represent a pleasant alternative to the utilitarian and basic construction of the existing stair enclosure. The roof terrace on which the new structure is to be constructed is large enough to comfortably accommodate it without damaging historic fabric or form of the roof. The glass balustrading may introduce a modern feature onto the building, but the contrast with traditional materials would be neither damaging to the building's architecture or to its interest. I fail to see what harm would arise from what is a well considered and appropriately scaled design.
7. Of the three in the listed group the appeal property is the only one not to retain its original valley roof. The proposal would do nothing to alter that position or set a precedent, given the circumstances. Furthermore, while the new structure would be larger than the existing one, it would remain subordinate to the terrace as a whole. It would appear different to what currently exists but for its size and design would not intrude on any of the features that contribute to the integrity of the group. In coming to these conclusions it follows that the proposed development would accord with the relevant sections of Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25.

Conservation Area Issue

8. The addition to the roof is unlikely to alter the character of the conservation area, given the nature of what is proposed. However, it would be visible from a number of viewpoints at Cartwright Gardens, Compton Place and Tavistock Place. Its visibility would be limited to glimpses between buildings in the case of the latter two positions and only from some distance along Cartwright Gardens. It would not protrude significantly above the existing stair enclosure and being positioned some distances from the front and rear parapets would not appear prominently in the skyline. The new structure would blend in with the range of other features appearing in the roofscape. The appearance of the conservation area would not be harmed but would remain preserved. The

proposal would therefore comply with policy objectives with regard to conservation areas.

9. In allowing the appeals, the standard time commencement conditions are imposed alongside another necessary to ensure that the development and works are completed in accordance with the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning. As external facing materials were the subject of pre-application discussion, a condition is included to provide the local planning authority control over this aspect of the proposal and to ensure that what is intended will be delivered. The conditions were not suggested by the parties but they are unlikely to be controversial or prejudice anyone's interests.
10. I have taken account of all other matters raised but find nothing of such weight as to alter my decisions to allow the appeals.

Ava Wood
Inspector

Schedules

Appeal A

The appeal is allowed and listed building consent is granted for replacement of rooftop stair enclosure with glazed aluminium framed structure at 3 Leigh Street, London WC1H 9EW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 2012/0188/L, dated 19 December 2011, and subject to the following 3 conditions:

- 1) The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Other than as required by condition 3, the works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 11/LS/01 Rev A, 11/LS/02 Rev B, 11/LS/03 Rev B, 11/LS/04 Rev B and 11/LS/05 Rev A.
- 3) The works hereby permitted shall not take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Appeal B

The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for replacement of rooftop stair enclosure with glazed aluminium framed structure at 3 Leigh Street, London WC1H 9EW in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 2011/6371/P, dated 19 December 2011, and subject to the following 3 conditions:

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) Other than as required by condition 3, the development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved

plans: 11/LS/01 Rev A, 11/LS/02 Rev B, 11/LS/03 Rev B, 11/LS/04 Rev B and 11/LS/05 Rev A.

- 3) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

End of Conditions