

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 February 2016

by Jane Miles BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9th February 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/15/3140817

1 Wells Square, London WC1X 0PB

- 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 Ms Conni Johnson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application ref: 2015/3318/P, dated 11 June 2015, was refused by notice dated 23 October 2015.
 - The development proposed is described as "Extend existing house into roofspace no higher than existing roof ridge line forward to front of the house set back 1200mm from front facade and rearward to rear facade. Chamfer flank side of roof to a lower level reducing height of peak of side flank wall. Built up portions of side flank wall in matching brickwork. Built up party wall in 9" brickwork and clad in vertical tiling. Clad front and rear elevations in vertical tiling, related internal alterations adding a new stair flight and required structure and partitioning. Install 2 no. new windows in the rear of the new extension and 1 no. new window in the front of the new extension".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Reasons

2. The appellant's detailed description of the proposed works is summarised on the Council's refusal notice as 'proposed roof extension to the front and rear elevations'. No. 1 is at one end of a two-storey terrace of four properties. The **main issue** in this appeal is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of no. 1, the terrace and the surrounding area.
 3. At present the key attributes of no. 1 and the terrace, in terms of character and appearance, are the overall uniformity and harmonious proportions of a basic rectangular form topped by a simple pitched roof. The appeal scheme would however result in some several fundamental changes.
 4. Extending the main rear wall upwards would create a three storey effect at the rear, with a partly flat roof at existing ridge height. That flat roof with an unusual chamfer along the outer side would extend across most of the depth of the house, to a point roughly 1.2m short of the main front wall. At the front the appearance would be similar in some respects to a dormer feature, but it would be an asymmetric feature and would extend across the full width of the property. A further consequence of a roof extension of this size, form and design would be a much larger and taller expanse of blank side wall.
-

5. The resultant built form would amount to a substantial increase in building mass at roof level, thereby creating a bulky and dominant feature even though it would not rise above the existing ridge level. Due to the combination of size, shape and design it would be an incongruous feature that would seriously disrupt the symmetry, proportions and harmony of the existing terrace. Thus it would not be a sympathetic addition to the terrace and it would not retain the overall integrity of the existing roof form.
6. The merits of the design as a prototype for extending other properties on the relatively low-density New Calthorpe estate¹ are not for me to consider but adding an extension of this form and design to just one end of a terrace of four dwellings would have a significant unbalancing and adverse visual impact on the terrace as a whole. I therefore conclude the proposal would seriously harm the character and appearance of no. 1 and the terrace. This would be the case irrespective of the intention to use matching colours, materials and windows.
7. The proposed extension would also detract from the area around it which is largely characterised by other terrace blocks. These too are mainly simple, uniform and proportionate in form, despite some variations in height and design and one or two examples of dormer extensions. In this site context the proposed extension would stand out as an incongruous feature, detracting from the character and appearance of its surroundings.
8. In the above respects the extension would fail to achieve the high quality design that development plan policy and the *National Planning Policy Framework* seek to achieve. Notwithstanding the appellant's views to the contrary I therefore conclude the proposal would conflict with Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025, Policy DP24 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, the 'Camden Planning Guidance Design' booklet (2015) and the *Framework*.
9. I have borne in mind that the terrace is within a gated estate and so does not front onto a public street, and nor is it listed or in a conservation area. These points do not however obviate the need to accord with national and local policies that seek to ensure good design which respects local context and character. Therefore, notwithstanding the proposal's benefits in terms of improving the appellant's accommodation, and having had regard to all other matters raised, overall I conclude the appeal must fail.

Jane Miles

INSPECTOR

¹ A point made in the design and access statement submitted with the application