

STATEMENT OF CASE

to accompany planning appeal application

Roof extension at 96B Queens Crescent, NW5 4DY
for Julietta Cochrane.

17 August 2014

INTRODUCTION

This appeal is made because I do not think application ref. 2014/2228/P can be changed to overcome the LPA's reasons for refusal so there is no other course open to me to obtain approval. The LPA declined to meet me to discuss the application during its life and did not seek to discuss it, never mind constructively according to the London Plan and the NPPF.

ISSUES IN CONTENTION AND IDENTIFYING COMMON GROUND

These have been proposed and are awaiting agreement.

APPLICATION FOR APPEAL COSTS

None.

DESIGNER

Gregory Munson is a Master of Arts in Architecture at Cambridge University (Class 2:1, 1988) and he has a Diploma in Architecture (also from Cambridge, 1991). He was a scholarship student and was elected a Corporate Member of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in 1995. He is a member of the Architects Registration Board (ARB). He is 47 years old. His CV will be provided.

STATEMENT OF CASE

Camden's planning guidance (CPG1 para 5.8) does not preclude a roof extension in this circumstance and indeed CPG1 para 5.7 could be held to apply here at no.96B. The proposed extension also fully complies with the CPG para 5.9 materials and detailed design paras 5.10 to 5.19. It also provides a good standard of accommodation identified as "high-priority" by CPG2. The parapet of the terrace of which the site forms part and the saw-tooth verge at the rear remain unaltered by the roof extension. Its visibility is a matter of fact not an adverse effect.

Planning refusals at no.98 and no.94 do not support refusal of this application. At no.98 the roof extension to enlarge a flat proposed by ref.2010/6521/P failed to comply with the LPA's Planning Guidance 2006 on roof design and terraces which is now superseded by CPG1 and was not similar as is claimed. Its refusal was not tested at Appeal. At no.94 the mansard roof extension to form an additional flat ref.2012/5567/P failed to comply with the CPG on accommodation as well as mansard roof design. Its refusal was upheld at Appeal ref. APP/X5210/A/13/2192010. Nor is ref. 2013/5739/P similar because that failed to comply with the CPG on mansard roof design.

If you can't build a roof extension in Camden if it's visible then the LPA's guidance should say so but it doesn't. The officer's report is a weak collage of statements which do not mention skyline or affects on the streetscene (both required by CPG1 para 5.8) and which fails to account for the sole remaining claim that the affect of the proposed extension's visibility is likely be adverse. Nor does the officer's report account for this outweighing the other benefits of the proposal according to NPPF.

This appeal should be upheld according to my Design & Access statement because the officer's report is an incorrect and illogical argument for the application to be refused. Approvals continue to be sought for roof extensions in Queens Crescent showing continued demand for such accommodation in a street which is neither subject to nor worthy of immunity. Applications such as this should be used as models to fulfill such demand not frustrate it.

END