

GROUND OF APPEAL
ALLEGED UNAUTHORISED OF TIMBER CLADDING AND UPVC WINDOWS
AT 70 CHARLOTTE STREET, LONDON, W1T 4QG

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1. This appeal follows the London Borough of Camden's decision to enforce against works at the above name site.

2. SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1. The application relates to a ground floor basement unit located on the east side of Charlotte Street in the parade between Tottenham and Chitty Streets. The building on the site is 4-storeys with basement, with the ground and basement floors in use for the provision of financial and professional services (Class A2). The upper floors of the property are in office use. The rear of the property abuts 4 Charlotte Mews.
- 2.2. The property is within a commercial parade which forms part of the Fitzrovia local area within the Central London Frontage. The site is located within the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and is adjacent to the Grade II Listed 72 Charlotte Street.

3. PLANNING POLICIES

- Camden Development Plan Document (Oct 2010)
- 3.1. For developments including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, policy DP24 requires the Council to consider, among other things, the character, setting, context, form and scale of neighbouring buildings, as well as the character and proportions of the existing building. It also states that, in conservation areas, development should preserve and enhance the area.

4. GROUND OF APPEAL

Ground (b)

- 4.1. The Appellant withdraws its claim on this ground.

Ground (c)

- 4.2. Planning permission (ref 2014/0911/P) was granted on 2nd June 2012 for the a development described as:

Erection of an extension to existing office at second floor level

- 4.3. Copies of the permitted drawings were included with the original appeal submission.

- 4.4. This permission was retrospective and the only element to change was the external materials eg the removal of the uPVC and timber cladding. These works have been implemented and completed. Photographic evidence had been submitted to the Borough in the week before the appeal was submitted with the view of having the notice withdrawn. No response was received to this entreaty.
- 4.5. The works on-site are in accord with the drawings referred to in Condition 2 of the Planning Permission, and as such there is no breach of planning control.

Ground (f)

- 6.3 The remedy sought by the LPA is excessive, and now entirely redundant, as the works have already been undertaken.

7 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The Borough has advised that they do not withdraw enforcement notices. It is hoped that the LPA will see the sense that pursuing the notice when it has already been an effective tool is no longer a proportionate use of its discretionary powers.