

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2014

**by C Thomas BSc DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 1 October 2014**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/14/2221121**

**University of London Officers Training Corps, Yeomanry House, Handel Street, London, WC1N 1NP**

- 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 Reserve Forces and Cadets Association For Greater London against the decision of London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref.2014/1498/P dated 25 February 2014 was refused by notice dated 8 May 2014.
  - The development proposed is new entrance.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building, the street scene and the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

## Reasons

3. The imposing frontage of Yeomanry House has a powerful visual influence on the appearance of Handel Street. This has been reflected in the identification of the building's positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
4. The proposal is a resubmission of a previously refused scheme and envisages replacing the existing timber-framed door and window with a fully glazed frameless door and window. This work would also involve the lowering of the window cill to nearly ground level and removing the existing stone mullion, together with the insertion of six multipane windows above the new door and window unit.
5. The Council acknowledges that the principle of replacing the existing door and side window is acceptable, but draws attention to its LDF Development Policy DP25 which establishes that alterations within conservation areas should preserve and enhance the character and appearance of such areas. This is broadly in accordance with the importance attached to the sympathetic design of new development in conservation areas set out in section 12 of the National

Panning Policy Framework (NPPF). LDF Development Policy DP24 expects high quality design in proposals to alter existing buildings, and this is endorsed in the relevant paragraphs of section 7 of the NPPF.

6. The proposal affects what appears to be a non-original entrance created within a former window opening. The removal of the stone mullion would fail to preserve a small but nevertheless significant element of the appearance of the building, the importance of which should not be easily downplayed. In that regard, I have given little weight to the appellant's argument that because the small paned windows at the upper level of the ground floor openings are readily visible in views along the building they are thereby a much more important element of the building than the stone mullions. In my judgement this is a false comparison because each element of the building's design contributes in a significant way to its overall character.
7. Nevertheless, the reinstatement of small paned windows above the proposed door and window would in principle be a positive improvement which would enhance the building's appearance. Even so I consider that the insertion of six multipane windows would not replicate the balancing feature which is seen above the window on the other side of the central element where there are eight windows. In reality, therefore, this aspect of the proposal would not preserve the harmony of the frontage fenestration.
8. I have taken into account that the provision of the wider entrance door would enable disabled access to the building. However, despite its obvious advantage to those wishing to gain access to the building, I consider this would not amount to a substantial public benefit. Accordingly, I have given this factor only limited weight which does not outweigh the significant harm to the character and appearance of the host building which I have identified.
9. As a result of the loss of the stone mullion and the lack of symmetry in the number of small paned windows with the comparable opening in the frontage, I have concluded that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host building. This would also have an adverse impact on the street scene and on the character and appearance of the conservation area. Accordingly the proposal would be contrary to LDF Development Policies DP24 and DP25.
10. I have taken into account all other matters raised in the representations but for the reasons I have given the appeal has been dismissed.

*C Thomas*

INSPECTOR