



# Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 19 February 2008

by **C J HOILE** MA(Oxon) 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](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Decision date:  
3 March 2008

718

## **Appeal A Ref: APP/X5210/A/07/2059223** **19-21 Monmouth Street, London WC2H 9DD**

- 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 Mon Plaisir Restaurant Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref: 2006/4525/P, dated 29 September 2006, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2007.
- The development proposed is described in the decision notice as "raising the height of front elevation parapet walls of No. 19 and 21 (Grade II listed), erection of roof extension, extension to existing duct to rear and internal alterations to upper floors to provide additional residential unit (Class C3) with roof terrace at rear 4<sup>th</sup> floor level, and alterations to fenestration".

## **Appeal B Ref: APP/X5210/E/07/2059224** **19-21 Monmouth Street, London WC2H 9DD**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Mon Plaisir Restaurant Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref: 2006/4531/L, dated 29 September 2008, was refused by notice dated 15 May 2008.
- The works proposed are described in the decision notice as those associated with "raising the height of front elevation parapet walls of No. 19 and 21 (Grade II listed), erection of roof extension, extension to existing duct to rear and internal alterations to upper floors to provide additional residential unit (Class C3) with roof terrace at rear 4<sup>th</sup> floor level, and alterations to fenestration".

## **Decisions**

### Appeal A

1. I allow the appeal, and grant planning permission for the raising of the height of the front elevation parapet walls of No. 19 and 21 (Grade II listed), erection of roof extension, extension to existing duct to rear and internal alterations to upper floors to provide additional residential unit (Class C3) with roof terrace at rear 4<sup>th</sup> floor level, and alterations to fenestration at 19-21 Monmouth Street, London WC2H 9DD, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 2006/4525/P, dated 29 September 2006, 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 revised details of all windows to the new roof storeys at Nos. 19 and 21 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 until samples of all the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted, including pipework and ducting, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### Appeal B

2. I allow the appeal, and grant listed building consent for the raising of the height of front elevation parapet walls of No. 19 and 21 (Grade II listed), erection of roof extension, extension to existing duct to rear and internal alterations to upper floors to provide additional residential unit (Class C3) with roof terrace at rear 4<sup>th</sup> floor level, and alterations to fenestration at 19-21 Monmouth Street, London WC2H 9DD, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref: 2006/4531/L, dated 29 September 2008 and the plans submitted with it subject to the following conditions:

1. The works hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

2. No works shall take place until revised details of all windows to the new roof storeys at Nos. 19 and 21 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 works shall take place until samples of all the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the works hereby permitted, including pipework and ducting, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

### **Main Issue**

3. Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving the building of No. 21 or its setting, or any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses. Section 72(1) of the same Act requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Covent Garden Conservation Area, within which the appeal site lies.

4. From what I have seen and read, I consider that the main issues in these appeals are whether the mansard roof extensions are of excessive scale, bulk or massing, and whether the architectural treatment employed is inappropriate within this terrace on the east side of Monmouth Street.

## Reasons

5. In the Council's decision, it was considered that the most relevant policies in the adopted 2006 Unitary Development Plan were: B1 – General Design Principles; B3 – Alterations and Extensions; B6 - Listed Buildings; and B7 - Conservation Areas. I have also read the Supplementary Guidance on design matters supplied by the Council.
6. These are two differently detailed terraced buildings, within a street frontage of dissimilar buildings of varying degrees of visual interest. No. 21 is listed Grade II, with its origins in the late C17th or early C18th; its structure was completely rebuilt above first floor level after a fire in the 1990's, so no original work of interest remains. No. 19 is an unlisted C19th building. The two buildings differ in the colour of their facing brickwork, and their window design, but in terms of plot width and the general positioning and size of fenestration they are similar. Planning permission was granted in 2000 raise the height of the front elevation parapet walls of the two buildings to provide an additional residential unit. The appellants say that the present proposals implement elements of that approved but unimplemented scheme, especially the front elevation walls.
7. There is no Council objection to the creation of new residential accommodation, or to the creation of a large opening in the party wall between the two buildings. It does not object to the heightened parapet line of No. 19. In the light of the planning permission and listed building consent given in 2000, which increased the heights of the parapet walls of No. 21, it does not oppose the addition of two storeys to that building. A proposed roof terrace area at the rear of No. 21 is not held to cause problems of overlooking or diminution of the privacy of residents of Nos. 23 or 25. The necessity to extend the existing extract duct as part of a scheme such as this is acknowledged, subject to acceptable external colouring.
8. However, the 2000 consents are said to have been for a small roof extension set back from both front and rear elevations and not apparent from street level. The Council's principal concern in the appeals before me is to what it considers the bulk and inappropriate detailing of the uniform mansards roofs proposed for the two buildings. Third party objectors, the CAAC and the Covent Garden Association oppose change, and object to a new non-historical uniformity.
9. I find that the changes to the elevations of both buildings to form a new uniform parapet level would do no harm to the architectural interest of either street façade. The detailing of the new third floor windows to No. 21 is appropriate, and the proportions and diminished height of the window openings accord with historic practice.
10. At roof level, the new mansard roof, of uniform design for the two properties, would replace existing roof structures on both buildings which I consider possess little visual interest. They are certainly different from each other now. No. 21 has an unpleasing metal railing along its parapet, and an ill-proportioned window and door set within a prominent roof storey. No. 19 has another kind of ugly railing above its parapet, and a smaller roof structure

which is not readily apparent from street level; it is not of such visual or townscape value that it needs to be retained.

11. Given the height of the two buildings, the narrowness of Monmouth Street, and the very different design of properties nearby, I do not find that the proportions or design of the new mansard roofs are architectural or historically inappropriate in this part of the Conservation Area. However, the design of the Monmouth Street mansard windows to both buildings is insensitive. The Council rightly wants amendment to the size of the dormer windows, to window pane sizes, and the cladding of the dormers. I consider that these windows must be reduced in width so that they do not exceed the width of windows below. Below parapet level, the shape and design of upper storey windows at No. 19 and No. 21 differs. It would be appropriate if the redesigned dormer windows for each building, which I require by means of a condition in my decisions, also differed slightly to reflect this fact, introducing a small but pleasing subtlety to the overall composition. I am confident this matter can be satisfactorily resolved by the Council, in discussion with the appellants.

### **Conclusions**

12. I conclude that the proposals, with the amendments I require, would not detract from the special architectural or historic interest of No. 21, or the existing visual merits of No. 19. I consider there would be no breach of the principles of any of the policies mentioned in the decision notices. I find that the character and appearance of this small part of the Covent Garden Conservation Area would be maintained, and even enhanced to a small degree. Thus, for the reasons given above I conclude that the appeals should be allowed.

*C J HOILE*

INSPECTOR