



Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 14 November 2006

Site visit made on 14 November 2006

by **Michael Hetherington** BSc(Hons) MA 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
e-mail: enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date **08 DEC 2006**

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/05/1194287

49 Allcroft Road, London, NW5 4NB

- 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 Stephen Kaufman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application ref. 2005/2722/P, dated 4 July 2005, was refused by notice dated 30 August 2005.
- The development proposed is: mansard roof extension to house.

Formal Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The appeal property is a three-storey flat-roofed building on the eastern side of Allcroft Road. To the north, a lower two-storey structure separates the site from a three-storey building on the corner of Allcroft Road and Queen's Crescent. To the south, the appeal property is adjoined by a complex of single-storey workshops (no. 47).
3. As a result, the appeal property is significantly taller than its immediate neighbours. The upper sections of its side elevations are easily seen, particularly in views from the junction of Allcroft Road and Queen's Crescent. This height discrepancy would be increased by the proposed mansard extension. The new roof would exceed the height of the existing chimneys and would increase the overall bulk of the building. Indeed, the new addition would be somewhat higher than the traditional "butterfly roof" of the building on the corner of Allcroft Road and Queen's Crescent, which is sited on higher ground. To my mind, the resulting structure would therefore appear unduly dominant in relation to adjoining properties. In my view, this would create a discordant effect in the street scene.
4. Furthermore, I consider that the detailed design of the new mansard roof, the lower slope of which would rise from above, rather than behind, the parapet wall of the front elevation, would make the addition particularly visible from the street below. This would exacerbate the adverse effects noted above. It would also conflict with the advice on mansard roofs set out in the Council's supplementary planning guidance (SPG) on roof extensions.
5. While I accept that there are a number of mansard roofs in the locality, including buildings in Queen's Crescent and Weedington Road, I saw on my visit this design is not a feature of properties in Allcroft Road, where the roofs of domestic buildings are characteristically flat. In my view, this would further emphasise the discordant nature of the proposal.
6. I am aware that planning permission has recently been granted on appeal for a development including a four-storey building at no. 47. However, I note that the top storey of that

proposal would be set back from the Allcroft Road frontage, thereby reducing its prominence when viewed from the street. Such a set-back is not proposed in the present scheme, which, furthermore, would be noticeably higher than the adjoining section of the approved development. I do not therefore feel that the approved building at no. 47, if constructed, would mitigate against the adverse effects described above. The appeal scheme would remain a discordant feature within the street scene.

7. For these reasons, I conclude that the appeal proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area. It would therefore conflict with policies B1 and B3 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2006, which was adopted subsequent to the Council's refusal of planning permission.
8. I accept that the development would provide additional low-cost residential accommodation and, while I note the comments of a neighbour, I have seen no substantive evidence that the additional bedrooms would harmfully impact upon the demand for parking spaces or local services. I agree with the Council that there would be an adequate degree of separation between the proposed extension and a south-facing window in the corner block on Queen's Crescent to avoid a harmful loss of light to that property. Nevertheless, these factors do not overcome my conclusion above. I have considered all the other matters raised but none change my overall conclusion that the appeal should not succeed.

M J Hetherington

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY

Mr Grant Leggett Planning Officer, London Borough of Camden
BSc

FOR THE APPELLANT

Mr Leo Kaufman 100 Princes Park Avenue, London, NW11 0JX

Mr Stephen Kaufman Appellant

OTHER INTERESTED PERSON

Mr M S Khan 88 Queen's Crescent, London, NW5 4DY

DOCUMENTS TABLED AT THE HEARING

- Document 1 Extract from the London Borough of Camden Replacement UDP 2006.
- Document 2 Council statement regarding updated policy position.
- Document 3 Photographs of appeal site.
- Document 4 Sales particulars in respect of 129 Weedington Road and 47 Allcroft Road (part).
- Document 5 Sketches made by appellant's agent.
- Document 6 Appeal decision dated 14 September 2006 regarding proposal at 129 Weedington Road and 47 Allcroft Road with extracts from relevant application drawings.

PLANS

Plan A Application drawings.