

L14/23/B / 8800485 [2485] DISMISSED *rec'd. 9/2/90*



Planning Inspectorate

Department of the Environment

Room 1404 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct Line 0272-218927

Switchboard 0272-218841

GTN 1374

FILE COPY

S

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN
TOWN AND COUNTRY
15 FEB 1990
RECOMMENDATION
ON BEHALF OF THE

Messrs Finch Associates
105 Lancaster Road
London
W11 1QF

Our reference
T/APP/X5210/A/89/133505/P7
Your reference
126

Date - 7 FEB 90

Gentlemen

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPEAL BY CARRINGTONS LTD
APPLICATION NO PL/8800485

1. As you know, I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above-mentioned appeal. This appeal is against the decision of the London Borough of Camden Council to refuse planning permission for the conversion and extension of existing rear annexe building to provide a 1-bedroom flat on land at Jessel House, Judd Street, London WC1. I have considered the written representations made by you and the council, together with those made by interested persons. I inspected the site on 10 January 1990.
2. In the light of the withdrawal of the objections made by interested persons, and the fact that the Jessel House Residents Association have no objection to the proposal, it is clear that the proposed conversion would not lead to the loss of storage facilities enjoyed by the existing residents, as alleged in the Council's reasons for refusal. Therefore, from my consideration of the written representations made and my inspection of the site and its surroundings I have come to the conclusion that the main issue is whether the proposal would result in a dwelling with an unacceptably poor environment that would contribute to an undesirably high density of development.
3. The building, a single-storeyed brick flat-roofed structure at present used sparsely for storage, is located at the southerly end of a long and narrow concreted back yard of Jessel House, a 7-storeyed block of flats with ground floor shops and restaurants. The building is bounded to the west by the tall rear wall of Jessel House, to the south by 4-storeyed club premises, and to the east by the tall blank brick wall of workshop premises fronting Speedy Place.
4. It was erected as a store following the grant of planning permission in 1953. Your clients seek to convert it to a dwelling to secure a satisfactory use for the building, that you say would otherwise remain vacant. You point out that a small dwelling such as you now propose would be in great demand in a central area such as this, and that the extension you propose on the northerly side of the building would result in an improvement in the appearance of the back yard of the flats.
5. However, as the Council point out, the building is hemmed in by existing tall buildings in a position where it would receive no sunlight even at the height of summer. I consider that even with the rooflights you propose, natural lighting to the rooms in the proposed dwelling would be poor, notwithstanding that the proposals would comply with the provisions of the



Building Regulations. The sole outlook from the dwelling would be northwards along the narrow back yard of the flats. In my judgement, the dwelling would have an unsatisfactorily poor environment.

6. Moreover, if permitted it would have the effect of increasing the residential density of Jessel House, that is already very high at 641 habitable rooms per acre, while the London Borough of Camden Local Plan states that the densities should normally be between 70 and 140 habitable rooms per acre. Although higher densities may be permitted within the Community Area (in which the appeal site is located), this is subject to the proviso that satisfactory conditions for residents can be achieved. I do not regard general density calculations on their own as a reliable guide to the acceptability of small-scale proposals such as this, but as the existing density is so much in excess of the normal range, this factor reinforces my conclusion that the proposal would result in a dwelling with an unacceptably poor environment that would contribute to an undesirably high density of development.

7. In my judgement the arguments raised by the Council outweigh the several and cogent arguments advanced by you, and were I to permit the proposal it would undermine the attainment of the Council's objective in the Local Plan to ensure that housing in the borough is set in a satisfactory environment. I have considered all the other matters raised in the written representations but do not find them to be of such weight as to alter the balance of my conclusions.

8. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal.

I am Gentlemen
Your obedient Servant



P J Roberts FRICS
Inspector