
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 February 2016

by Richard S Jones BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 11 April 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/15/3138053
49 Hartland Road, London NW1 8DB

- 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 & Mrs Cakir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2015/3859/P, dated 7 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 9 September 2015.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension 600mm set back from the parapet wall with 2 sash windows at the front elevation and two velux windows at the rear elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site sits within a long row of Victorian terrace properties on the north western side of Hartland Road. Although connected, there are two distinct character sections within this row.
 4. The longer section running from the Chalk Farm Road end is made up of two storey dwellings with an additional storey provided by mansard roofs, each incorporating two front facing dormers.
 5. The appeal property sits within the shorter 3 storey section towards the railway line. Although the precise detailing of the dwellings vary, there is a consistency to their general composition and height and to the character of the terrace. Each dwelling frontage incorporates a parapet concealing the roofs behind, presenting a consistent and continuous roofscape which is undisturbed by any existing roof or dormer extension.
 6. In consideration of the appeal proposal, the Council has referred to Camden Planning Guidance relating to Design (CPG 1), which states that a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. Circumstances highlighted include where there is an unbroken run of valley roofs; where complete terraces or groups of
-

buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions and the building is designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level. CPG 1 has been prepared to support the policies in the Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) and is an adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). I have therefore attached significant weight to CPG 1 in my decision.

7. Although, mansard roof extensions are clearly part of the street scene of Hartland Road and the wider area, the proposed mansard roof would be viewed within a visually distinct, uniform and intact character section of terrace where no such features exist. As such, this section materially differs to the adjoining section of two storey terraces and this is reflected in its inclusion within a local list for being an intact terrace which shares uniformity in terms of scale and form.
8. Within this context, the proposal would protrude above the existing parapet level and in doing so significantly disrupt the unbroken and unimpaired roof line of this section of terrace, thereby undermining its architectural composition and that of the host dwelling. Such visual disruption would be compounded by the site's mid-terrace location which would be readily apparent within the street scene of Hartland Road and from the rear of properties on Clarence Way.
9. The appellants have drawn my attention to roof extensions which have been approved by the Council in Hartland Road at No 30 in November 2013 (reference 2013/6622/P) and No 32 (reference 2005/3230/P) in September 2005. The Council has explained however, that the 2005 application at 32 Hartland Road was determined under a superseded policy and that the 2013 application at 30 Hartland Road was granted on the basis that the roof line would already be disrupted by the extension at No 32, and the symmetry between the buildings would be restored by the extension at No 30.
10. Moreover, the appeal site is located within a separate, larger terrace where the harm I have described would be materially greater. In any case, each proposal must be judged on its own merits on the basis of the development plan and all other material considerations and this is what I have done in this case.
11. I accept that the Council has not raised any concerns relating to the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring properties or the standard and layout of the space that would be provided. However, the absence of such harm cannot weigh in favour of the proposal as such but should properly be considered as neutral in the planning balance. It follows therefore that this and the lack of neighbouring objection cannot mitigate the material harm I have identified in respect of the character and appearance of the area.
12. Similarly, I appreciate the appellant's desire to provide additional family accommodation and to continue to live in the property but the personal circumstances identified would not outweigh the harm I have explained.
13. The appellant has stated a willingness to make design changes such as setting back the roof extension further. However, this is not the scheme currently before me and I have considered the proposal solely on the basis of the proposals submitted to and considered by the Council.
14. For these reasons, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and this visually distinct section of terrace

along Hartland Road, contrary to Policy CS5 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 LDF and Policy DP24 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025 LDF and to the Council's SPD relating to design. These seek, amongst other matters, to manage the impact of growth and development in Camden, including protecting and enhancing the environment, and require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and to consider character, context and the form and scale of neighbouring dwellings and the character and proportions of the existing building.

15. For the above stated reasons, and taking all other matters into consideration, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Richard S Jones

Inspector