



Department of the Environment
 Room 13/19
 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct line 0272-218 875
 Switchboard 0272-218811
 GTN 2074

M15/22/5-29738
 Rev. No. 977
 (Dismissed)

Thamyris Zorkas
 Architect
 83 Grosvenor Avenue
 Canonbury
 LONDON N5

Your Refrence		
CAMDEN		
Our Refrence: N		
T/APP/5008/A/80/5448/G7		
13 NOV 1980		
		80

Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
 APPEAL BY JOPHILL LTD
 APPLICATION NO. CTP/815/22/5/20738

1. I refer to your client's appeal, which I have been appointed to determine, against the decision of the London Borough Council of Camden to refuse planning permission for the change from residential to office use of premises at No. 23 John Street, London WC1. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the council, and also those made by interested persons. I inspected the site on Thursday 25 September 1980.
2. From my inspection of the site and the surrounding area and from my consideration of the representations made I find that the principal issue in this case is whether there are overriding reasons for the proposed development bearing in mind the prevailing planning policies for the area and the character of the neighbourhood.
3. The appeal site is an early c18 terraced brick-faced property in a street of similar buildings all with direct frontage to the back of a wide footway. The main exception is a modern purpose built office block at Nos. 21-21a. No. 23 is a listed building in a designated conservation area. It has previously been in residential use for which planning permission was given in 1962. Although at the time of my inspection the ground floor was being used as an office, I understand that this use has not been authorised.
4. During the accompanied inspection a careful survey from the footway was made of all properties in John Street, and also of part of Doughty Street, the physical northward extension of John Street. They are both streets of positive architectural character and are relatively quiet. There are more properties in office use than in residential use. However, several properties appear to be occupied as dwellings, either as single units or as flats. The appeal property is certainly capable of being used residentially, since there are kitchen and/or bathroom facilities available in the basement, ground, first, second and third floors. The living rooms at ground and first floor level in particular are I consider of elegant proportions, and all rooms are in good decorative condition.
5. While it is true that there is only a small garden space to the property and no car parking other than at the kerb side, I am quite certain that the presence of offices in the vicinity does not stand in the way of satisfactory residential occupation of this property. Moreover, it should as a listed building continue to be properly maintained in such a use.

6. The relevant planning policies appear to me to reinforce the retention of the site in residential use. The Greater London Development Plan written statement approved by the Secretary of State in 1976 is quite explicit on the point that permission for a change from residential use will not normally be given, because of the continued and pressing need for such accommodation in the metropolis. Similarly, the adopted Plan for Camden 1979 focuses the strategic GLDP Policy on this area. There is to be restraint on office uses south of Easton Road ie in the area of the site; and again changes from residential use are to be resisted. Having considered these and all other matters raised, I do not consider that there are overriding reasons to justify the proposed change of use.

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

I am Sir
Your obedient Servant

AA Williamson

A A WILLIAMSON
Inspector