



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 October 2015

**by Les Greenwood MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 04 November 2015**

---

### **Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/15/3130167**

#### **35 Rudall Crescent, London NW3 1RR**

- 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 Mr Alan Brown against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2015/1167/P was refused by notice dated 27 April 2015.
  - The development proposed is the installation of folding doors to the full width of the garage door, the alteration of a ground floor front window to 3 panel folding doors, the alteration of 1 first floor front window fenestration, the replacement of front and rear windows, the replacement of the rear doors, the replacement of the front door and side light and the enlargement of the waste and recycling store.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of folding doors to the full width of the garage door, the alteration of a ground floor front window to 3 panel folding doors, the alteration of 1 first floor front window fenestration, the replacement of front and rear windows, the replacement of the rear doors, the replacement of the front door and side light and the enlargement of the waste and recycling store in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2015/1167/P, dated 9 February 2015, 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: 1164.01.11(B), 01.12(A), 01.13(A), 01.14(A), 01.15(B), 02.11(A), 03.11(B), 03.12(A), 03.13(A), 03.14 and 05.11(A).
  - 3) Materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the walls and roof of the alterations to the house hereby permitted (excepting the glazed roof to the rear) shall match those used in the existing building.

### **Main issue**

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area.
-

## Reasons

3. 35 Rudall Crescent sits in the middle of a terrace of low, 2 storey modern houses set within a part of the conservation area mainly typified by much taller, red brick Victorian buildings. Like the others in the terrace, No 35 sits behind a high buff brick wall and timber gate. The architecture and materials of these houses pose an almost total contrast to that of the more traditional houses nearby. The front walls are buff brick with white painted timber cladding at first floor level. The roofs are low in pitch and covered with interlocking concrete tiles. Although the windows have white painted timber frames, their large paned format is not at all traditional in design terms. The Council's Conservation Area Appraisal for Hampstead aptly finds merit in this contrasting architecture, which helps to emphasise the qualities of the older buildings.
4. A planning permission has already been granted for a number of alterations to No 35. The key difference, and the one to which the Council objects, would be the use of aluminium in all windows and doors including new glazed doors in place of the up and over garage door.
5. Although all of the houses in this terrace appear to have timber windows, there are others very nearby with more modern materials. The use of aluminium is appropriate to the design and proportions of the house, so that the change of materials would not be out of character. Aluminium framing would also provide clean lines that would complement the overall architectural concept. I furthermore see no clear reason to close down part of the garage opening with timber cladding as the Council would prefer.
6. The Council would regret the loss of a fan light and of the uniformity of the terrace, but there is no great conservation value in either of these. The proposal would improve the quality of the house and would not harm the street scene at the front. At the back the house is screened from most views and is not architecturally notable. The upgrading involved in the changes there would again improve the building.
7. I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and the appearance of the conservation area. It therefore accords with the shared aims of Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, to secure a high standard of design that respects local context and character, preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets.
8. I impose a condition listing the approved plans, for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning. Where necessary, new wall and roof materials should match existing in order to ensure that the house continues to fit in well with the rest of the terrace.
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