



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 October 2007

by **Paul K Jackson** B Arch (Hons) RIBA

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:
5 November 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/07/2049842

3-7 Delancey Street and 3A & 4 Delancey Passage, London NW1 7NL

- 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 Calyx Property Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2007/0128/P, dated 21 December 2006, was refused by notice dated 13 June 2007.
- The development proposed is redevelopment of site to provide new café/restaurant & linked music recital space/practice hall together with 3 No. 1 bed apartments: note: alteration to existing permission ref 2006/2680/P.

Decision

1. I allow the appeal and grant planning permission for redevelopment of site to provide new café/restaurant & linked music recital space/practice hall together with 3 No. 1 bed apartments: note: alteration to existing permission ref 2006/2680/P, in the terms of the application ref 2007/0128/P, dated 21 December 2006 and the drawings submitted with it, subject to conditions 2- 15 inclusive previously imposed on planning permission ref 2006/2680/P and the following new condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

Reasons

2. Delancey Street is mixed in character. Victorian terraced dwellings lie alongside industrial and retail outlets, mid 20th century dwellings and other varied uses. In contrast to many of the streets that intersect with it, I consider the architecture of buildings in Delancey Street lacks an obvious sense of coherence. Delancey Passage is a short pedestrian alleyway, currently blocked at the far end. It has little impact on the character of the street in itself but is an important element in the design of the appeal building, the fenestration of which responds to the corner.
3. I give little weight to the idea that the proposed gable end adds conceptual clarity or that it improves the aesthetic balance of the scheme. The relationship between the massing of the front and rear elements of the building is likely to be visible only from a few vantage points. The differences in roof form will not be obvious, especially if redevelopment of other sites in the area takes place as suggested.
4. Notwithstanding that, altering the roof profile at this point from hip to gable would have an insignificant effect on the street scene or the character of

Delancey Passage. The strong horizontal parapet line along Delancey Street would remain. There are other pitched gable ends in the vicinity, notably at No. 15; and amid the great variety of buildings in the area, this proposal would not appear out of place or harm the character or appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area. It would not conflict with the unashamedly modern design of the building. Nor would it fail to comply with the aims of policies B1 and B7 of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP).

5. As this is a new permission, I have imposed a new condition imposing the standard time limitation on development. The permission is also subject to conditions 2- 15 attached to the original planning permission, which I consider remain relevant and necessary.

Paul Jackson

INSPECTOR