
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 29 March 2016

by **S J Papworth DipArch(Glos) RIBA**

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

Decision date: 18 April 2016

Appeal A: APP/X5210/W/15/3140433

Appeal B: APP/X5210/W/15/3140730

Appeal C: APP/X5210/W/15/3140642

Railway Club, College Lane, London

- The appeals are each made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission for demolition of the existing clubhouse building and the construction of twenty houses arranged in terraces of two and three storeys with lower ground levels and block of ten flats comprising studio, 2 and 3 bedroom units. The provision of underground car parking with a ramped access from the existing site entrance off Little Green Street, the planning permission Ref APP/X5210/A/02/1097183 being granted on Appeal on 23 June 2003.
 - The appeals are made by Four Quarters (College Lane) Ltd against the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - **Appeal A** The application Ref 2015/2559/P, dated 7 May 2015, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 2 on materials.
 - **Appeal B** The application Ref 2015/2920/P, dated 21 May 2015, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 2 on materials (to a different area of the development).
 - **Appeal C** The application Ref 2015/3618/P, dated 25 June 2015, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No 3 on landscaping.
-

Decision Appeal A

1. I allow the appeal and approve the details of materials submitted pursuant to condition No 2 attached to planning permission Ref APP/X5210/A/02/1097183 granted on 23 June 2003 in accordance with the application Ref 2015/2559/P, dated 7 May 2015.

Decision Appeal B

2. I allow the appeal and approve the details of materials submitted pursuant to condition No 2 attached to planning permission Ref APP/X5210/A/02/1097183 granted on 23 June 2003 in accordance with the application Ref 2015/2920/P, dated 21 May 2015.

Decision Appeal C

3. I allow the appeal and approve the landscaping details submitted pursuant to condition No 3 attached to planning permission Ref APP/X5210/A/02/1097183 granted on 23 June 2003 in accordance with the application Ref 2015/3618/P, dated 25 June 2015.
-

Main Issue

4. In each of the appeals this is the effect of the changes now proposed on the character and appearance of the area, including the nearby Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, and on the quality of the development.

Reasons

5. The development comprising 20 houses and 10 flats was granted on appeal and the Inspector considered the effect on the character and appearance of the area, finding the proposal to be an imaginative design solution with high quality materials that would harmonise with the existing brickwork of the Ingestre Estate, safeguarding the landscape features of the site.
6. The Inspector did not approve details, instead conditions were attached seeking approval prior to development commencing. Subsequent to that such details were submitted and approved by the Council so that the two conditions that are now the subject of this appeal were discharged and the development was able to proceed. That development was well-advanced at the time of the present appeal site inspection, which comprised a walk along College Lane and as close as was possible on the other sides.
7. The London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policy DP24 on securing high quality design states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider among other matters; c) the quality of materials to be used and g) the provision of appropriate hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments.
8. Whilst this appeal was made against the failure of the Council to determine the applications, the Council's Statement to the appeal makes clear their approval of the details now proposed, as variations to those previously approved. In addition the Council provides a commentary on the changes now proposed and the rationale behind their approval. In particular the details of the changes are set out in both the Council and the appellant's Statement and are acknowledged to be to a high standard, whilst it is the appellant's intention that those approved in 2008 should be refreshed to ensure that the development is of a high, contemporary, standard. That approach appears reasonable and appropriate at this stage of the development process.
9. On the information available, the details now proposed would be of a high standard as sought in Policy DP24, and would accord with the findings of the previous Inspector that led to the original grant of permission. For the reasons given above it is concluded that the appeals should be allowed and approval is given to the details as now submitted pursuant to conditions 2) and 3).

S J Papworth

INSPECTOR