
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 June 2015

by M Brookes BA MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 July 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/15/3002972

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. 2014/5879/P was refused by notice dated 4 December 2014.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

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

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a ground floor and part first floor flat within a residential terrace.
4. There is a two storey, flat roofed extension of uniform depth across the rear of parts of No 4 and No 6 Sumatra Road. Both properties also have longer single storey extensions to the rear of the two storey extension. These are of similar depth, although at the appeal property it is cut back adjacent to the common boundary. It is also somewhat wider, extending alongside much of the two storey element and close to the boundary with No 2 Sumatra Road. Its flat roof overhangs the rear wall to create a canopy.
5. There is a deeper two storey extension across part of the rear of No 2 Sumatra Road with a roof terrace. It is set off the boundary with No 4 and does not extend quite as far back as the single storey extensions at No 4 and No 6.
6. The proposal is to infill the cut back of the existing single storey extension and extend the whole structure to the rear by one metre.
7. Although the extension would in itself be quite small, it would result in extensions across almost the entire width of the site and deeper than the main range of the building. These extensions would not be subordinate, but would be disproportionate to the host building to the detriment of its character and appearance as well as to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, notwithstanding the existence of large extensions to the adjacent properties.

8. In addition, although there is foliage and fencing to the side boundaries, there is a strong sense of openness to the rear gardens of properties in Sumatra Road and Solent Road despite the gradual extension over recent years of buildings into the gardens. This remaining openness, which makes an important contribution to the character and appearance of the area, would be compromised by the further projection of built development into the rear garden and beyond extensions at the adjacent properties. The extension would therefore also be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in this respect.
9. In reaching this conclusion about the impact on openness I have taken into account the fact that the extension would project no further than the existing canopy. However, the canopy has much less effect on openness than the extension would have because it is narrower than the proposed extension and allows for views over the boundary fences and beneath the canopy. The side parapet walls of the extension would also be higher above adjacent fences than the existing canopy.
10. My conclusion is that the proposed development would have an unacceptably harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. It would therefore be contrary to Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 (2010) and Policy DP24 of Camden Development Policies 2010-2025 (2010) which require development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character. It would also conflict with paragraphs 56 and 58 of the National Planning Policy Framework insofar as they seek high quality design that respects local context and character.

Other matters

11. The Council has expressed concern about the small size of the remaining garden, but I share the view of the inspector who dismissed an appeal (ref APP/X5210/A/14/2225305) in 2014 in relation to a larger extension that an acceptable level of outdoor space would remain.
12. I accept that the additional accommodation would be of benefit to occupiers of the flat but this benefit does not outweigh the harm it would cause.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised the appeal is dismissed.

M Brookes

INSPECTOR