
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 July 2016

by N McGurk BSc (Hons) MCD MBA MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 July 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/16/3147399

21 Healey Street, Camden, London, NW1 8SR

- 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 Matthew Ross against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2015/6097/P, dated 29 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 4 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is changes to existing dwelling, including: demolition of existing two storey rear extension, new two storey rear extension, addition of a new room at roof level and interior layout modifications.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for changes to existing dwelling, including: demolition of existing two storey rear extension, new two storey rear extension, addition of a new room at roof level and interior layout modifications at 21 Healey Street, Camden, London, NW1 8SR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2015/6097/P, dated 29 October 2015, subject to the conditions set out in the attached schedule.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council refers to an application¹ for a mansard development at a neighbouring property, No 14 Healey Street, that was granted at appeal². Whilst the Council states that this was for a mansard "much lower in height and more lightweight," I am mindful that the proposed development the subject of this appeal bears similarities to the, now existing, mansard development at No 14 Healey Street, both in terms of being low in height and lightweight in appearance.
3. The Council has also provided information relating to other applications for mansard roofs at Healey Street that have been refused. No substantive evidence is provided to demonstrate that these other proposals were the same as that the subject of the appeal before me.

¹ Ref: 2011/5193/P.

² Ref: APP/X5210/D/12/2168834.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this case is the effect of the development proposed on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a three storey mid-terraced Victorian dwelling, located on the east side of Healey Street. Materials comprise stock brick with stucco facing and dressings and the house has a valley roof, largely concealed from view behind a stucco parapet.
6. It is situated in a residential area, which is characterised by densely developed housing, comprising terraces of tall, brick-built Victorian dwellings that are similar in appearance. Whilst the appeal property is neither a Listed Building nor in a Conservation Area, the prevalence of period features provides an attractive sense of uniformity.
7. During my site visit, I observed that many dwellings have been extended, and/or altered, especially to the rear, where there are numerous extensions of various shapes, sizes and forms. Whilst varied in style, the extensions and changes to the rear of the terrace within which the appeal property is located, tend to appear subordinate to host properties and due to the overall height and massing of the terrace, do not appear unduly dominant or intrusive.
8. I also noted, during my site visit, that the various alterations apparent along Healey Street include various modern features, including a spiral staircase, a porthole window, white rendering, an aluminium frame grey window, variously sloping roofs, large panes of glazing, a balcony and so on. Whilst individually striking in their own way, none of these features, either on their own or together, are so intrusive or dominant as to detract from the overall sense of uniformity provided by the terrace as a whole. Rather, they provide for a pleasing sense of interest and reflect various efforts made to make the best use of space within a dense urban area.
9. Due to the height of the terrace, the valley roofs of dwellings are, to some considerable degree, hidden from view from street level along Healey Street. Indeed, whilst there have been changes to the valley roofs of a number of properties along Healey Street, the roofscape appears predominantly unaltered when seen from street level. I find that this would remain the case were the proposed roof extension to be developed.
10. Further, its sensitive design would mean that views of the proposed roof extension from upper floors of houses on the opposite side of Healey Street would be of a modest, modern and attractive feature, that would be low in height and would sit comfortably within the surrounding roofscape.
11. The Council, in support of its case, states that the roof line along Healey Street is unaltered, but then goes on to refer to an existing "rooftop box structure at number 23." During my site visit, I observed changes to the roofscape at Nos 15 and 25 Healey Street. Consequently, the proposal would be situated within an already altered roof profile, albeit, this would not lead to any significant harm.

12. Due to the juxtaposition of streets in the area, the rear of Healey Street does not feature prominently in wider views, but, rather, appears as a subordinate backdrop to the front of Grafton Crescent. Given this, and the wide and varied range of changes to the rear of Healey Street, I find that the proposed development would appear neither dominant nor incongruous, but instead, it would simply form one of a number of subordinate changes to the rear of the terrace. As such, it would appear in keeping with its surroundings.
13. I note above the wide variety of changes that have occurred along Healey Street, mostly to the rear of the terrace. These include two storey extensions. The proposed ground and first floor extension, including the glass balustrade and terrace, would appear in keeping with these existing extensions, whilst adding interest to the rear of the terrace. I am also mindful in this regard of Healey Street's subordinate appearance when seen against Grafton Crescent.
14. Taking all of the above into account, I find that the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. It would not be contrary to the Framework, to Core Strategy³ policy CS14, to LDF⁴ policy DP24, or to Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 (2015), which together amongst other things, protect local character.

Conditions

15. I have considered the conditions suggested by the Council against the six tests set out in paragraph 206 of the Framework. A condition relating to the relevant plan is necessary for the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.
16. A condition controlling materials is necessary to protect local character.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, the appeal succeeds.

N McGurk

INSPECTOR

**Schedule of Conditions attached to
Appeal Decision APP/X5210/D/16/3147399
21 Healey Street, Camden, London, NW1 8SR**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

³ Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 Local Development Framework (2010).

⁴ Camden Development Policies 2010-2025 Local Development Framework (2010).

- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 147/02; 147/03; 147/04; 147/05; 147/06; 147/07.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the external surfaces of the building shall match those used in the existing building.
-