

22 DEC 1984

Direct line 02/2-218927
Switchboard 02/2-21881

Disnissed.

Mr A G Kirk c/o Flat 31 67/69 Chancery Lane LONDON WC2

Sir

1

OLN COM

Your reference

Our reference T/APP/X5210/A/86/56995/P2

LONDONISORBUGH OF CAMDEN TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACTS

1 5 APR 1987

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDURE COMMENDATION AGREED APPLICATION NO:- F5/9/28

ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL

- 1. As you know I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine your appeal against the decision of the Camden London Borough Council to refuse planning permission for erection of an additional storey to provide a self-contained 2-bedroom flat at 8 Frognal Lane, London NW37 I have considered the written representations made and I inspected the site on 19 November 1986.
- 2. I have, of course, your Grounds of Appeal but as I sit to draft this decision letter I have no council or other response to those grounds or clarification of any sort of the 3 Reasons for Refusal.
- 3. So in the absence of specific justification of Reasons 2 and 3, I can only say from my own observations that neither the plot size nor the increased building size can or could be seen (from the external inspection which both you and the council thought suitable) to differ significantly in plot ratio or density from those at 7 and 9 Longland Gardens which, you say, have the benefit of recent planning permission.
- 4. I note however that 8 Frognal Lane is in a conservation area and have had recent occasion in this context to refer to relevant parts of the extant Local Plan and the emerging alterations. I am aware that they follow well known longstanding national advice offered in Circular 23/77 and most recently underpinned in Circulars 14 and 31/85 by setting out a framework for designation and preservation of Conservation Areas and I see the main issue in this case as whether or not the additional storey proposed would harm the character of this part of the conservation area.
- 5. I saw that character as one of mixed groups of good sized 3-4 storey detached and semi-detached late Victorian houses quite generously laid out on steeply sloping land around the 3 sides of a generously sized area of private open land which distances 8 Frognal Lane and 7-9 Longland Gardens considerably from one another.
- 6. No. 8 is one of a prominent upslope group of 4 similar detached houses numbered 2-8: Nos 24-32 are another such group. They all have moderately pitched plain hipped roofs very different in proportion, bulk and character from the more steeply pitched mansard type common roofs of the group of semi-detached houses which separate them and in style and scale are closely akin to the row of semi-detached houses on Longland Gardens which includes Nos 7 and 9.
- 7. I thought the additional common roof storey to 7-9 Longland Gardens obtrusive and out of character in that row. I see protection of the otherwise well preserved



character of this part of the conservation area as an interest of acknowledged importance and am in no doubt that imposition of a similarly shaped and raised roof on 8 Frognal Lane would be so out of scale and character in the group of houses to which it is akin as to be seriously harmful to local conservation area aims.

- 8. I take your point that what you propose would add to national housing stock but do not see this as an overriding consideration in this conservation area.
- 9. Since drafting the above I have received further representations from Frognal Lane Gardens Ltd and 2 local residents but find nothing in them or in any other matters you raise to lead me to considering changing my decision.
- 10. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby/dismiss this appeal.

I am Sir

Your obedient Servant

D G M CHALMERS AADipl Regarch FCIArb

Inspector