



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 5 March 2009

Site visit made on 5 March 2009

by **Tim Wood** BA(Hons) BTP 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:
7 April 2009

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/08/2086810

Camden Lock Hotel, 89 Chalk Farm Road, London NW1 8AR

- 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 Weston Williamson Architects against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2007/6377/P, dated 18 December 2007, was refused by notice dated 5 September 2008.
- The development proposed is the re-cladding of the existing hotel, development of a roof extension including new bed spaces.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the re-cladding of the existing hotel, development of a roof extension including new bed spaces at Camden Lock Hotel, 89 Chalk Farm Road, London NW1 8AR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2007/6377/P, dated 18 December 2007, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) No development shall take place until detailed drawings of the proposed windows and the roof extension and details and samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building 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) No development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The Statement shall provide for:
 - i) the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors
 - ii) loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - iii) storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development
 - iv) the erection and maintenance of security hoarding
 - v) measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
 - vi) the hours of construction working

- vii) a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works

Preliminary Matters

- 2. Although not mentioned in the reason for refusal, the Council's statement referred to the unacceptable effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the adjacent conservation area and the setting of the listed Roundhouse building. However, at the Hearing the Council stated that they no longer raised issues in relation to these matters.
- 3. Some of the elevations show a sign placed on the top of the proposed roof extension. This is not a matter that is before me in considering this planning appeal.

Main Issue

- 4. Taking account of the above, I consider that the main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character of the area.

Reasons

- 5. The existing 4 storey hotel sits at the junction of Chalk Farm Road (A502) with Crogsland Road. The ground floor elevations facing the 2 roads contain part-glazed sections similar to shop-fronts. The upper floors of those elevations are of brickwork and contain a number of windows arranged in a regular pattern. Some interest is added to these elevations by the use of banded brickwork.
- 6. Buildings close to the appeal site are generally 4 storeys in height, although some variation is evident, including the 3 storey public house opposite. The most imposing building in the immediate area is The Roundhouse on the opposite side of Chalk Farm Road, which is Grade II* Listed and is within the Regent's Canal Conservation Area.
- 7. The existing building has a plain appearance and contributes little to the local character. The bricks used in the elevations are deteriorating and the uPVC windows and the shop-fronts result in a rather down-at-heel impression. These features combine to have a negative effect on the street-scene.
- 8. The proposal would involve the re-cladding of the upper elevations in a light coloured render and the replacement of the windows with ones of a projecting design. The shop-front would be replaced by dark grey render and glazing. The Council accept that these elements of the proposal would improve the appearance of the building. I agree that there would be a significant benefit to the locality as a result of these factors.
- 9. The proposed roof extension would be constructed from a combination of clear and white glazing within an aluminium frame. It would accommodate 8 additional bedrooms and would be set back from the Chalk Farm road frontage by around 1.7m. The elevation to Crogsland Road would be on the raised parapet and would be set back by about 0.5m. The Council considers that the harm arising from this element of the proposal outweighs the benefits of the other elements.

10. I consider that the proposed roof extension would appear light-weight and would complement the contemporary style created by the rest of the proposed works. The set-back of the Chalk Farm Road elevation would reduce its impact. I accept that the proposed set-back of the Crogsland Road elevation would be small, but I consider that the overall complementary style and use of materials would mean that it would not have an overbearing impact on the street-scene and would appear subservient to the main part of the building. Although it would be taller than the adjacent public house, its general style and massing would not be out of place, particularly in the context of the more recently constructed buildings on Chalk Farm Road. Furthermore, when considered as a whole, the proposal would have a considerably beneficial effect on the street-scene, compared to the existing building. Therefore, I find no conflict with Policies B1 and B3 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan.

Conditions and Obligation

11. I have considered the conditions suggested by the parties having regard to the advice in Circular 11/95 *'The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions'*. I agree that it is necessary to require the submission of details and samples of the materials to be used in the external works and detailed drawings in respect of the new windows and the roof extension, in order to ensure a satisfactory appearance.
12. The Council also suggested that a Section 106 Obligation should be required to cover a Construction Management Plan and Servicing Management Plan. Each would require details relating to numerous matters, including vehicular access, routes for construction vehicles, swept paths for such vehicles, parking and loading arrangements, hours of working, congestion management methods, frequency of service vehicles, the nature of goods to be delivered and many more.
13. In relation to a Servicing Management Plan, I consider that the addition of 8 bedrooms to the existing 33 bedrooms would not justify the requirement, as set out by the Council. I consider that the increase in bedrooms represents a relatively small one and the effects on the servicing of the hotel would also be small.
14. In relation to the suggested Construction Management Statement, I consider that the principle is one which can suitably be controlled by a planning condition. In relation to the detailed matters suggested by the Council, it was accepted at the Hearing that many of these matters can be suitably controlled by Highways legislation and do not need to be controlled by this planning permission. In addition, I consider that it is not necessary to control the size of delivery vehicles, to submit swept path analysis of vehicles, the start and end dates for construction, congestion reduction measures and the establishment of a construction working group.
15. However, I consider that there is a need for the following matters to be included, the parking of construction, delivery and site workers vehicles; loading and unloading of construction materials; the storage of materials; the erection of a hoarding around the site; measures for the control of dust and

dirt; the recycling of waste arising from the demolition/construction; the hours of construction works.

Conclusions

16. I have taken account of all other matters raised in writing and at the Hearing but find nothing of sufficient weight to lead me to a different conclusion. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr P Breese RIBA BA(dip) ARB	Weston Williamson Architects, 43 Tanner Street, London SE1 3PL
Mr W Lingard BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI	Turley Associates, 25 Saville Row, London W1S 2ES
Mr N Charalambous LLB(Hons) MBA	Roundhouse Property Investments Ltd, C/O Goldstil Ltd, Linton House, 39 Highgate Road, London NW5 1RS

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Ms A Olcar-Chamberlin BSc MSc	Planning Officer, London Borough of Camden
Ms V Fowler MA(Hons) PGDip(Cons)	Conservation and Urban Design Officer, London Borough of Camden

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr W Lee	90A Pratt Street, London NW1 0DL
----------	----------------------------------

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Council's letter of notification of the Hearing and list of recipients