



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 7 November 2011

by Simon Miles BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 November 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/11/2161888
132 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8JA

- 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 Maribelle Beckman against the decision of the London Borough of Camden Council.
 - The application Ref 2011/3428/P, dated 7 July 2011, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2011.
 - The development proposed is additions and alterations to include erection of additional storey extension at rear first floor level and erection of a roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for additions and alterations to include erection of additional storey extension at rear first floor level and erection of a roof extension at 132 Gloucester Avenue, London NW1 8JA in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2011/3428/P, dated 7 July 2011, 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: C12812 – 100 Rev A, C12812 – 101 Rev A and C12812 – 102 Rev A.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The description of the proposed development, as given above, is taken from the application form, as this is more accurate than that given on the application form.

Main Issue

3. This is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.
-

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to 132 Gloucester Avenue, a traditional terraced property within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area, which derives much of its special character from its fine stock of period properties. These include the traditional terraces within Gloucester Avenue. Because of the height of the terrace, the proposed roof extension would not be visible in public views from the adjacent section of the street. This is the case, even allowing for the butterfly design of the parapet, because of the setback of the proposed roof extension.
4. Although the property lies on a bend in the road, my observations indicate that even in long distance views along Gloucester Avenue public views of the roof extension would be extremely limited. Indeed, the only significant views would be gained from the upper floor windows of nearby properties. These views need to be considered in the context of the numerous existing roof additions already present within Gloucester Road.
5. These existing roof extensions include a number of centrally placed roof extensions, of a different design, within the adjacent section of Gloucester Avenue. These are clearly historic additions having an attractive and cohesive style as part of a group. However, Gloucester Avenue contains many other roof additions, some of which pre-date current policy and guidance, whilst others are more recent. Taken as a whole, roof extensions of varying size and design are a well-established part of the street scene.
6. The proposed roof extension, whilst perhaps not complying in all respects with the detailed design criteria set out in the Council's adopted policies and guidance, is entirely consistent with this established character and the numerous similar such roof extensions. The fact that the street scene retains its quality and integrity despite these additions only serves to reinforce my view that, because of the very limited public views from street level, the proposed roof extension would be neither prominent nor obtrusive.
7. Turning to the proposed rear extension, this would enlarge upon an existing two storey addition. Such additions are common up to two storeys. Although somewhat large by the general standards of the area, the proposed three storey rear extension would remain subservient to the host building and, by removing various poorly resolved existing additions, would improve and consolidate the appearance of the rear elevation.
8. As is often the case, the rear elevation lacks the symmetry and cohesive appearance of the principal public façade. This reflects the private character of the rear elevation, whereby the only significant views are from the upper floor windows of nearby properties. I consider the detailed design of the proposed rear extension, considering its position to the rear and secluded setting, to be acceptable.
9. This leads me to conclude that the proposed development would preserve the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. I therefore find the proposal to be acceptable in terms of Policy CS14 of the adopted London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy 2010-2025, Policies DP24 and DP25 and the Council's LDF Development Policies 2010-2025 and Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 *Design*, insofar as these seek to promote the highest standard of design, whilst

preserving and enhancing the character, heritage and setting of conservation areas. The proposal is also compliant with the draft National Planning Policy Framework, which is a material consideration, to the extent that this is concerned to protect the built and historic environment.

10. Overall, I find that there are no compelling or over-riding reasons why the appeal should not succeed. It is necessary that the development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning. I will therefore impose a condition detailing the relevant plans, in addition to the standard time limit. A further condition relating to materials is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the area.

Simon Miles

INSPECTOR