



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2010

by **Peter Eggleton MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
23 September 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/10/2124784

37 Goodge Street, London W1T 2PU.

- 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 Russell Kilikita against the decision of Camden Council.
- The application Ref 2009/5677/P, dated 27 November 2009, was refused by notice dated 9 February 2010.
- The development proposed is the demolition of the existing butterfly roof and a new fourth floor extension to create a two bedroom flat.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The property lies within the Charlotte Street Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Appraisal identifies strong parapet lines as an important characteristic of the period terraces and it raises concerns with regard to development that would interrupt the consistency of uniform terraces. I found that from public vantage points, views above the parapet line of this terrace are broken, particularly at the adjacent property number 35 but also a second property to the east. Other than these however, my perception was of a terrace that has generally retained its original form and character. I found the roof structure at the adjacent property, although part of a listed building, to detract from the character and appearance of the terrace overall.
 4. I agree with the Council that the design of the frontage of the proposed structure would fail to respect or reflect the character of the host building. It would not complement the vertical emphasis to the building's design and it would not respect the formal alignment of existing fenestration. Its curved roof would also be at odds with the overall character of the property. It would be set back from the parapet and this combined with its limited height would reduce its prominence. It would however be visible over the parapet from certain vantage points and it would also be clearly visible from within buildings to the front and rear.
 5. It would align with and have some similarities with the adjacent roof addition. However, its pairing with that extension would increase the overall prominence of these features. As I find them to be harmful to the original character of the
-

terrace, this would be to the detriment of the street scene. The existing roof additions emphasise that the remainder of the terrace is largely unbroken in terms of its visible roof form and that the period character of the terrace, above ground floor level, is largely unaltered. I find that this addition would fail to respect the character of the building and it would increase the prominence of the existing unsatisfactory roof additions. It would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

6. The proposal would be contrary to Policies B1, B3 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP) as these include requirements that development respects its site and setting; improves attractiveness; would not harm the appearance of the area; and would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area. It would also be contrary to the Camden Planning Guidance document as this suggests that development is unlikely to be acceptable if it is located within an unbroken run of valley roofs and the terrace is largely unimpaired by alterations. Whilst the roof form of this terrace has some notable alterations, I consider that overall it retains its original character. I have afforded weight to this document as it was adopted following public consultation and it generally accords with the policies of the UDP.
7. I have been informed that a proposal for this roof was accepted in 1983. I do not have details and therefore cannot compare it with this proposal. Although it was allowed after the conservation area was designated it has not been implemented. I am not satisfied that it sets a precedent for new development now. I have noted the examples of other roof extensions locally but these do not persuade me that this addition would be satisfactory.
8. This proposal would result in much improved accommodation, including access to external roof terraces. Although I do not find the low area of roof within the existing flat to be particularly detrimental, the living conditions of future residents would be enhanced overall. This weighs in favour of the proposal. I also acknowledge the support offered by the neighbouring resident for the provision of additional roof greenery.
9. I note the concerns of nearby residents. Whilst I do not agree that this structure would unacceptably harm the outlook or resulting in significant increases in shading of nearby properties, I do share concerns with regard to privacy and disturbance. I accept that the properties in Goodge Street and Colville Place have a relatively intimate relationship. The additional roof accommodation would not alter this situation significantly but the roof terraces would provide much greater opportunities for overlooking and noise, particularly to the rear. However, given my main findings, these are not issues on which my decision would turn.
10. Whilst there are matters that weigh in favour of the proposal, I conclude that they are insufficient to outweigh my concerns with regard to the main issue. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

Peter Eggleton

INSPECTOR