

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 November 2014

**by K R Seward Solicitor**

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

**Decision date: 16 December 2014**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/14/2225305**

#### **4 Sumatra Road, London NW6 1PU**

- 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 Mrs Y Birk Narkis against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2014/2445/P, dated 4 April 2014, was refused by notice dated 8 July 2014.
  - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
- 

#### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

#### **Main Issue**

2. The main issue raised is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area.

#### **Reasons**

3. No 4 Sumatra Road forms part of a four storey residential terrace. It is divided into three self-contained flats. The appeal property is the ground floor flat which also encompasses part of the first floor. It has exclusive use of a relatively small and narrow rear garden.
4. Across both Nos 4 and neighbouring No 6 there is a large two storey flat roofed projection extending part of the width of each dwelling. In front of this, the appeal property has an existing single storey extension. It is stepped in from the side boundary with neighbouring No 6, but continues along the side of the two storey element close to the boundary with No 2. The flat roof overhangs the rear elevation to create a shallow canopy.
5. The proposal is for a further single storey extension. This would add another 2m in depth to the existing extension after removal of the roof canopy. Plus, it would infill the side gap next to No 6 to create a virtually full width extension, the small gap to the boundary with No 2 being retained.
6. There is no single defining characteristic to the rear elevation of the row which has been subject to a number of alterations and additions. Indeed, No 2 has a large white painted two storey extension with roof terrace. Whilst prominent by reason of its height, depth, scale and finish, there is a wide gap between it and the boundary with No 4. It does not project quite as far as No 4's existing

single storey extension. To the other side boundary, No 6 has a single storey extension projecting a similar distance to that at No 4.

7. All of the existing extensions have flat roofs and the proposal would be no exception. Its glazed rear elevation would also produce a pleasing, clean and tidy contemporary appearance which would harmonise with the traditional brickwork of the main elevation. However, the cumulative effect of the existing and proposed extensions would amount to very sizeable additions. Combined, they would almost double the original ground floor accommodation. As a result, the proposal would give rise to additions disproportionate to the host dwelling and which would be dominated by the extensions.
8. Moreover, none of the extensions in the row project further than the existing single storey extension. The proposed extension would project noticeably beyond the neighbouring extensions. Although there is fencing to the side boundaries and foliage, there is a strong sense of openness to the rear gardens. There are wide views across the gardens including those backing onto the properties in Solent Road. The extent of the proposed extension for this mid terrace property would be apparent above the fencing. Due to the degree and extent of the projection, it would appear as an obtrusive feature, out of keeping with the existing pattern of development. Whilst it would be seen against a backdrop of the extension at No 2, the existence of another prominent extension nearby would not be reason to allow a proposal that would be harmful.
9. By intruding further into the rear garden space the extent of openness would also be compromised. The loss of further garden space would have a negative visual impact on the appeal site and its surroundings.
10. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. As such, it would be contrary to Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy, 2010-2025 and Policy DP24 of the Camden Development Policies, 2010-2025 document and Paragraphs 56 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they all seek high quality design which respects local context and character.

### **Other Matters**

11. Whilst it does not form a reason for refusal within its decision notice, the Council has raised concerns regarding the adequacy of the remaining garden size to provide acceptable living conditions for the occupiers. The remaining garden space would be small. Nevertheless, it includes an elevated area of lawn which would provide adequate space for sitting out, play for children and other everyday activities. Thus, an acceptable level of outdoor space to meet the needs of the occupiers would remain.

### **Conclusion**

12. For the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*KR Seward*

INSPECTOR