
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 June 2015

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

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

Decision date: 14 July 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/15/3004000

Flat A, 7 Holmes Road, London NW5 3AA

- 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 Claire Jenkins against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2014/4761/P, dated 21 July 2014, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2014.
 - The development proposed is a single storey rear extension with a courtyard (internal).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension with a courtyard (internal) in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2014/4761/P, dated 21 July 2014, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 7HR/04, -05, -06, -07 and -08.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building, except as otherwise specified in the application.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

3. 7 Holmes Road is a mid-terraced house of a relatively plain and unadorned Victorian style, now divided into flats. Flat A, on the ground floor, has a courtyard garden which is fully enclosed by high walls, including the building's own 2 storey rear wing and the taller gable wall of an adjoining building. The proposal is to infill part of this courtyard, linking to an existing single storey rear extension to form a new living room. A roof light would also be inserted into the mono-pitched roof of the existing extension.
-

4. This would be a well-designed, small scale infill, making good use of an area which is already tightly enclosed. The extension would be low in height and simple in form. It would be set away from the main structure so that it would not harm the design and proportions of the building. It would not be seen from any public viewpoint and would not be at all prominent or intrusive in any private views.
5. The courtyard at present is not valuable to the character of the building or the area. It has only limited amenity value for occupiers of the flat due to the effect of the surrounding walls on outlook and light. The proposed internalisation of some of this space would to my mind increase the quality of the building and the overall amenity value offered by the flat.
6. I conclude that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the building or the local area. It therefore accords with the shared aim of Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy, Policy DP24 of the Camden Development Policies and the Camden Planning Guidance 1 *Design*, to promote high quality development that respects local context and character.
7. Local residents have raised some further concerns. Construction noise, whilst inevitable, should be short lived. The new extension and rooflight would be at a low level, limiting any overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbours.
8. I impose a condition listing the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning. A condition requiring the use of matching slates and other specified materials is also necessary, to protect the character and appearance of the area.
9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR