
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 November 2015

by H Butcher BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 December 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/15/3103305

Flat B, 177 Prince of Wales Road, London, Camden NW5 3QB

- 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 C Mourouzides against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2015/0766/P, dated 10 February 2015, was refused by notice dated 2 April 2015.
 - The development proposed is a mansard loft conversion.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the mansard on the character and appearance of the building, terrace, and street scape.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a residential flat. It forms part of a mid-19th Century terrace property which has three storeys plus a basement. The building has a traditional parapet roof to the front and valley roof to the rear, and a number of original features which include decorative iron railings to the front.
4. The terrace to which the appeal property belongs is identified as a non-designated heritage asset which has architectural and townscape significance. It is identified in Camden's Local List (January 2015) as being of identical form to the nearby Listed group at 131-149 Prince of Wales Road. The original detailing and largely unaltered parapet roof line of this row of terrace properties contributes to its historic value.
5. The south side of Prince of Wales Road, where the appeal property is situated, is characterised by uniform rows of traditional terrace properties with parapet roofs. Just adjacent to the appeal site is a new development of terrace properties. These form a continuation of an older row of terrace properties. The detailing on the older properties has been carefully reproduced on the new including the distinctive parapet roof form. As such, this new development reinforces the unaltered and traditional character of the terraces along this stretch of Prince of Wales Road.
6. The proposed mansard would appear as an isolated and prominent addition to the roof of the appeal building. The increased height of the party walls and

chimney as well as the relatively wide cheeks of the proposed dormer windows would add to the bulk of the roof extension drawing undue attention. The mansard roof would also disrupt the otherwise largely unaltered roof line of the terrace, causing significant harm to the traditional appearance of the terrace as a whole, and the street scape generally.

7. Whilst the proposed mansard would be set back from and behind the front parapet wall and constructed from matching materials it would, nevertheless, be clearly visible from the street as Prince of Wales Road is relatively wide. The junction with Queens Crescent opposite would provide further long views of the mansard. I note that in places the original detailing to the front elevations of some of the properties in the terrace has been lost. Nevertheless, these relatively minor alterations to the appearance of the terrace do not justify allowing the mansard given the harm identified above.
8. For these reasons the proposed mansard would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the building, terrace and street scape. It would therefore conflict with policies CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy (2010-2025), DP24 of the Camden Development Policies (2010-2025) and Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design (2013). These policies, amongst other things, require new development to respect local context and character, and to preserve heritage assets. The appellant has referred to a number of other policies but I have determined the appeal against the policies before me which I consider to be the most relevant for the purposes of the main issue in this appeal.
9. In coming to the above conclusions I acknowledge that the appeal site is not located in a Conservation Area. It is, however, identified as being a heritage asset. The Development Plan in identifying such heritage assets seeks to conserve Camden's heritage and this is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), of which a core planning principle is the conservation of heritage assets. The Framework also states that it is proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness (para 60). The proposal would be contrary to these aims and as such cannot be considered sustainable development.

Other matters

10. Reference is made to two other mansard style roof extensions on Prince of Wales Road. These are some distance from the appeal site and do not provide an immediate context. The appellant also refers to two appeal decisions in other London Boroughs. I have not been provided with full details therefore I cannot be sure of the precise circumstances relating to these. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own planning merits.
11. I note that the building opposite the appeal site has a mansard style roof. This building is, however, materially different to the appeal property being a block of purpose built residential flats with an integrated mansard across the main roof of the building. In addition to this it does not contribute to the area's historic character in the same way as the appeal building.
12. The appellant comments that valley roofs belonging to single houses could be in-filled under permitted development rights. Such rights do not normally apply to flats, and even if some of the terrace properties in the area were to exercise these rights I have no evidence before me to indicate that such works

would be as substantial as the proposal before me. Consequently, this matter does not lead me to conclude differently in terms of the harm identified with respect to character and appearance.

13. Notwithstanding the general encouragement making efficient and effective use of land receives from the Framework and the economic benefits of growth and development, whilst these matters carry some weight, they are not overriding. Similarly, whilst acknowledging that the proposed mansard extension would provide additional space for a growing family, and noting that no letters of objection were received, these matters do not outweigh the harm found with respect to the main issue in this appeal.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given the proposed mansard would cause harm to the character and appearance of the building, terrace and street scape. Having regard to all other matters raised, even if taken together, these would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

H Butcher

INSPECTOR