



The Planning Inspectorate

An Executive Agency in the Department of the Environment and the Welsh Office

243294.CS4

Room 1404
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

910/22/12
4117

Direct Line 0117-987-8927
Switchboard 0117-987-8000
Fax No 0117-987-8769
GTN 1374-8927

DISMISSED

David Mikhail Architects
42, 43 Gloucester Crescent
London
NW1 7PE

Your Reference

Our Reference
T/APP/X5210/A/94/243294/P8

2 FEB 1995

Dear Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990, SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6
APPEAL BY DAVID ZUHAIRE MIKHAIL
APPLICATION NUMBER:- PL/9400167/R1

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal. This is against the failure of the London Borough of Camden Council to give within the prescribed period notice of their decision in respect of an application for permission for roof top room and division into three one-bedroomed flats at 193 Prince of Wales Road, London NW5. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by an interested person. I inspected the site on 10 January 1995.

2. The description above refers to your amended scheme dated 4 May 1994 which proposes 3 flats as opposed to 1 flat and 1 maisonette. The application relates to the existing first and second and proposed third floor; the maisonette on the ground floor and basement level is unaffected. I take into account the Council's resolution of 10 November 1994 that had there been no appeal, the Council would have refused the application because of its adverse effect on the appearance of the building and the surrounding area by virtue of its bulk and detailed design. The Council have no objection to further sub-division of the property.

3. It therefore seems from all I have seen and read that there is one main issue in this case which is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and its relationship to the terrace of which it is a part.

4. Like a number of terraces of similar age and style, this property has what the drawings show to be a flat roof hidden behind a parapet with fire regulation party walls containing chimney stacks rising above it. No 199 Prince of Wales Road at the end of the terrace has what I consider to be a particularly obtrusive extra storey, and there are other roof extensions in other terraces to the east, none of which, as

you say, are designed in a very sympathetic manner. You do not regard these as precedents and neither do I.

5. I noted the somewhat disparate nature of buildings in Prince of Wales Road, but seen from the front, this terrace retains a largely unspoiled roof line apart from No. 199. The existing parapet would hide the front mansard from the pavement in front of the property, but substantial parts would be seen from the opposite pavement, increasing as one travelled north up Queens Crescent. Intervening trees may provide some screening in spring and summer but this was not apparent at the time of my visit. I am not convinced that the front dormer french windows are so out of scale as to be unacceptable in themselves. However in this particular location I consider they would tend to emphasise the existence of an extra storey which, because of the general uniformity at roof level, would appear intrusive however constructed. As to the proposed rear elevation, this can be seen to a greater degree than your photograph would indicate from certain parts of Haverstock Hill near Chalk Farm Station. I note your point about organic growth at the rear of properties of this age, and the substantial rear rebuilding in undistinguished brickwork, but I do not consider these justify the erection of another storey, particularly one which would in my opinion be so out of character with the prevailing materials and likely to be even more obvious when light is reflected off the glazed elements. I conclude on the main issue that the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the building and its relationship to the terrace of which it is a part, and that the scheme is unacceptable.

6. I have taken account of all other matters put to me, including your discussions with the Council, but none in my opinion has sufficient weight to alter my conclusion on the main issue.

7. For the above reasons, and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss this appeal and refuse to grant the planning permission applied for.

Yours faithfully

M. J. Thomson

M J THOMSON BA(Hons) DipTP
Inspector