
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 January 2016

by Philip Lewis BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 03 February 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/15/3135217
97 Parkway, London NW1 7PP

- 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 Blue Dot Properties Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2014/7841/P, dated 19 December 2014, was refused by notice dated 6 July 2015.
 - The development proposed is extension to the 2nd and 3rd floors over the existing terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for an extension to the 2nd and 3rd floors over the existing terrace at 97 Parkway, London NW1 7PP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2014/7841/P, dated 19 December 2014, subject to the conditions set out in the schedule to this decision.

Main Issue

2. The main issue for the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated within the Camden Town Conservation Area and consists of a flat on the 2nd and 3rd floors of No 97 Parkway, a terraced building with commercial premises at street level. The character of the area is derived from its town centre location, with a wide mix of land uses evident and variety in the scale, design and appearance of buildings. The appeal proposal involves the extension of the rear of the existing flat over part of an existing roof terrace. To one side of the appeal site is No 95 Parkway which was redeveloped as part of a larger scheme and presents a two storey flank wall along much of the length of the roof terrace. To the other side is No 99 Parkway which is similar to the appeal property in terms of rear building line and provision of a roof terrace. I saw at my site visit that the outlook to the rear of the appeal property is largely enclosed by residential and commercial buildings.
 4. The proposed extension would not be visible from Parkway and as the principal elevation of the building would not be changed, there would be no effect upon the existing street scene. At my site visit, I was unable to see the appeal site
-

from the streets to the rear of the appeal property and consider that the proposed development would not be visible from public places. It would however be seen in a number of private views.

5. Whilst the existing flat is based upon the footprint of the host building, the proposed extension would follow the line of the mansard type roof of the neighbouring No 95 over the roof terrace. In the context of the scale of the surrounding buildings, the proposed extension is not in my view excessive in terms of height, bulk or massing. Given the changes evident to other parts of the rear of the terrace, I do not consider that removing the rear building line would be harmful in this case. The Camden Planning Design Guidance 1 Design (CPG) in paragraph 4.13 discourages extensions which are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions. In this case, the proposed extension would follow the lines of the flank wall of No 95 and would therefore comply with the guidance. Whilst the development at No 95 predates the CPG and is part of a larger scheme, it nevertheless is appropriate for me to apply the guidance in the CPG which specifically references neighbouring projections and nearby extensions. No 97 is identified as being a positive building within the Camden Town Conservation area and the appeal proposal would not change this as the principal elevation would not be altered.
6. In terms of detailing, the rear of the existing flat is unremarkable in appearance, with UPVC windows and door and a tile hung mansard roof. The proposed extension would not be out of keeping with the variety in building materials evident in the host and surrounding buildings and the appearance of the proposed window and door openings, whilst not of a traditional form, would not harm the appearance of the host building or surrounding area given the context. The appeal proposal, through extending an existing residential unit, would not have an adverse effect upon the character of the Conservation Area.
7. I consider therefore that the proposed extension would not be an overly dominant or inappropriate addition to the host building and terrace and would not harm their integrity or composition. The proposed development would have a neutral effect upon the character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area and therefore would preserve its character and appearance. The appeal proposal would not conflict with Policy CS14 of the Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy 2010-2025 which includes that development is of the highest standard of design and respects local context and character, preserving and enhancing Camden's heritage assets including conservation areas. It also accords with Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies 2010-2025 Policy DP24 which is concerned with securing high quality design and Policy DP25 which seeks to maintain the character of conservation areas including only permitting development that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

Other matters

8. The appeal proposal relates to an existing roof terrace which is not screened from the terraces of neighbouring properties. Whilst overlooking between the existing terraces can occur at present, it is considered that the provision of privacy screens to the sides of the roof terrace remaining would safeguard the privacy of both neighbouring occupiers and future occupiers of the proposed extension. At my site visit I saw the rear of the neighbouring property at

No 99. I consider that due to the orientation of the rear elevation of the building and the position of its doors and windows, the proposed development would not have a significant effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 99.

Conditions

9. The Council has suggested a number of conditions which I have reviewed in accordance with the Planning Practice Guidance. I consider it reasonable and necessary to impose conditions in relation to timescale, to specify the approved plans and the use of matching materials in the interests of proper planning. I have also added a condition regarding the times when construction can take place to safeguard living conditions of nearby residents and a condition to secure the provision of privacy screens to the sides of the roof terrace to safeguard living conditions of nearby residents and future occupiers of the extended flat.

Conclusion

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

Philip Lewis

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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: No 42 01-01; No 42 01-02; No 42 01-03; No 42 01-04; No 42 01-05; E01 Rev A.
- 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 unless otherwise specified in the approved plans.
- 4) Demolition or construction works shall not take place outside 0800 hours to 1800 hours Mondays to Fridays and 0900 hours to 1300 hours on Saturdays nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.
- 5) The extension hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of privacy screens to be erected to the sides of the roof terrace adjoining Nos 95 and 99 Parkway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved privacy screens shall be erected prior to the first occupation of the extension and maintained thereafter.