



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 march 2010

by **Peter Fenwick BA(Hons) BPI 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:
30 April 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/09/2114037 **Flat 3, 2 St Albans Road, London, NW5 1RD**

- 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 Ms Godsí Emami against the decision of the council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2009/2479/P, dated 19 May 2009, was refused by notice dated 15 July 2009.
- The development proposed is additions and alterations to include the erection of a single storey front extension of a residential flat (Class C3).

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and, in particular, whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. St Albans Road is a wide street within the conservation area and is characterised by a range of 19th and 20th century properties built in a variety of styles. The historic form and detail of No 2 St Albans Road remains largely intact. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement (CAA) suggests that the semi-detached appeal property, and attached semi No 4, were built in the 19th century. Notwithstanding the later side extension on No 4, these two semi-detached properties, of mainly brick and painted render, make an important contribution to the character of this part of the conservation area in terms of the street scene and in themselves.
 4. The existing flat-roofed bathroom extension of the appeal property is sited on the second floor flat roof of the side entrance wing. The impact on public views of the bathroom extension, with its non-matching external materials and bulky appearance, is reduced by its significant set back and the low parapet of the entrance wing.
 5. The proposed extension would enclose the flat roof area, which cannot be currently easily or safely accessed, behind the low parapet and would link with the bathroom extension. The proposed extension would rise to approximately eaves level and be constructed of frameless glass. Notwithstanding its siting
-

behind the parapet and set back from the main front wall of the building, the extension would be in an elevated and prominent position clearly visible to passers by.

6. Although the roof of the proposed sunroom would be below the existing main roof, its size and forward siting would result in a bulky addition that would unduly dominate the view of the property. This harm would not be overcome by any set back. The extensive use of glass contrasting with the existing brick and render on No 2 would add to its visual prominence in the street scene. In my view, the proposed development would appear incongruous and out of character with the existing building and surrounding area.
7. Furthermore, the proposed development would increase the height of the existing side entrance wing reducing its subordination to the host building and would cause visual harm in the street scene. As such the proposal would be contrary to Camden Planning Guidance 2006 (CPG) that requires extensions to be subordinate to the main building in terms of siting, proportions and materials.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the host property and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. It would conflict with Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 policies B1, B3 and B7 and guidance and advice within the CPG and the CAA, which seek to ensure that new development, amongst other matters, respects its site and setting, with extensions subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation, and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area.
9. Whilst I acknowledge the appellant's wish for extra living space and the letters of support, these matters do not overcome the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Peter Fenwick

INSPECTOR