



# Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 July 2010

**by Richard McCoy BSc, MSc, DipTP,  
MRTPI, IHBC**

**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](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:  
18 August 2010**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/E/09/2117851**

**8 St Martin's Almshouses, Bayham Street, Camden Town, London,  
NW1 0BD**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Mr Nicolas Chadwick against the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2009/2838/L is dated 8 June 2009.
- The works proposed are erection of a rear single-storey extension.

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/09/2117228**

**8 St Martin's Almshouses, Bayham Street, Camden Town, London,  
NW1 0BD**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Nicolas Chadwick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2009/2837/P is dated 8 June 2009.
- The development proposed is the erection of a rear single-storey extension.

---

## **Preliminary matter**

1. I note the *Reasons for Refusal* submitted with the Council's statement. While these are not the decisions as jurisdiction over that was taken away when the appeals were lodged, I have treated them as the decisions the Council would have made, had it been empowered to do so.

## **Decisions**

### **Appeal A**

2. I allow the appeal and grant listed building consent for the erection of a rear single-storey extension at 8 St Martin's Almshouses, Bayham Street, Camden Town, London, NW1 0BD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2009/2838/L, dated 8 June 2009, subject to the following conditions:
    - 1) The works hereby authorised shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent.
    - 2) No works shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension 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.

- 3) Upon completion of the works hereby approved, any damage caused to the building by the works shall be made good within 6 months in accordance with a scheme submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority.

### **Appeal B**

3. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for the erection of a rear single-storey extension at 8 St Martin's Almshouses, Bayham Street, Camden Town, London, NW1 0BD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2009/2837/P, dated 8 June 2009, 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: drawing Nos. 4538 01, 4538 02, 950/01, 950/02, 950/03, 950/04, 950/05 and 950/06.
  - 3) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension 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.
  - 4) Upon completion of the development hereby approved, any damage caused to the building by the works shall be made good within 6 months in accordance with a scheme submitted to, and approved by, the local planning authority.

### **Main issue**

4. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the works/development on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.

### **Reasons**

5. No. 8 stands near the southern end of a short terrace of almshouses that is a grade II listed building and is adjacent to the Camden Town Conservation Area. Shortly after being built each dwelling in the terrace was provided with a small rectangular rear "wash house" extension accessed via a short passage. Proposed is the demolition of this extension and its replacement with a larger structure.
6. Many of the wash houses within the terrace have been significantly altered over the years. In several cases, the original form of the wash house is indiscernible having been heightened or extended to the side while in other cases large window and door openings have been formed, and the original narrow link to the dwelling enlarged. In the case of the appeal site wash house, the door and window openings have been changed, the link enlarged, and a conservatory and lean-to added.
7. This has resulted in the rear of the terrace having a very non-uniform and irregular appearance. I consider that the significance of the wash houses to the listed building was derived from their uniform appearance and distinctive

- plan form. From what I observed this has been irrevocably changed in several of the dwellings.
8. Given the degree of change that has occurred to the rear of the terrace, I consider that the listed building could sustain further sensitive alteration. This proposal, in my opinion, would be such an alteration as it would be single storey in height, would pick up design elements from the wash house such as the hipped roof and would be linked to the main dwelling via a narrow, flat-roofed passage. While the use of green oak, along with brick, as a wall cladding would be novel in this context, I see no reason why such an innovation should not be permitted as part of a scheme of sensitive, managed change to the listed building. Consequently, the proposal would respect the listed building's overall proportion and scale, and would maintain its architectural integrity.
  9. Against this background I consider that the proposal could be erected in place of the existing extension without harm or loss to the building's special interest. Accordingly, the proposal would not conflict with the advice in Policy HE9.1 of Planning Policy Statement 5; *Planning for the Historic Environment* as echoed in the policies of the Unitary Development Plan.
  10. In addition to standard time, I shall attach conditions in respect of compliance with the approved plans and materials. I shall also attach a condition regarding making good following the carrying out of the works for the reason given by the Council. These are necessary to ensure a satisfactory development and accord with the advice in Circular 11/95.
  11. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

*Richard McCoy*

INSPECTOR