

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2009

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.g ov.uk

Decision date: 19 August 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/09/2118262 The City Literary Institute, 1-10 Keeley Street, London, WC2B 4BA

- 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 Peter Davies against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2009/4603/P, dated 28 September 2009, was refused by notice dated 13 November 2009.
- The development proposed is a 2 storey extension to form 2 new classrooms to the existing building on the 4th floor roof area.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposal on the setting of a listed building and a conservation area.

Reasons

- 3. The appeal site is occupied by a tall educational building which stands in close proximity to the Grade II* listed Freemasons' Hall and the boundary of the Seven Dials (Covent Garden) Conservation Area. The proposal would be erected on top of the flat roof of a 4 storey block which projects towards Wild Street from the main 7 storey block of the college. Planning permission was granted in 2009 for a single storey extension in this position which has not been implemented.
- 4. I consider that the bulk and height of the proposal would be such that it would be very prominent in views westward along Wild Street when approaching from the Kemble Street direction. In particular, it would obscure views of the tower of the Freemasons' Hall which occupies the corner of that building and is a prominent feature that closes the Wild Street vista, when seen from the junction with Kemble Street.
- 5. I note the appellant's argument that the proposal would not be visible from streets within the conservation area. Nevertheless, I consider that by obscuring views of this attractive feature that is a notable and very distinctive feature of the local area when seen silhouetted against the skyline from Wild Street, the proposal would harm the setting of both the listed building and the conservation area. Accordingly, the proposal would be contrary to saved

Policies B1, B3A, B6 and B7 of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006, adopted June 2006.

6. Therefore, for the reasons given above and having regard to all of the other matters raised in the representations, including the appellant's arguments that additional classroom space is required at the college to meet demand from students, the Council gave inconsistent advice during the planning process, the view is not a strategic one and the area is dominated by the huge presence of Space House, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard McCoy

INSPECTOR