
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 July 2016

by **S M Holden BSc MSc CEng MICE TPP FCIHT MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 25th July 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3148520
64 Charlotte Street, London W1T 4QD

- 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 Roger Lass of Salash Holdings Limited against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2015/6701/P, dated 27 November 2015, was refused by notice dated 10 March 2016.
 - The development proposed is erection of a mansard roof extension and the creation of a single family sized residential unit and associated minor external alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a mansard roof extension and the creation of a single family sized residential unit and associated minor external alterations at 64 Charlotte Street, London W1T 4QD, in accordance with the application Ref: Ref 2015/6701/P, dated 27 November 2015, subject to the following 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 and documents:
 - Drawing Nos: 1329-PA-001 B; -002 B; -003 B; -004 B; -005 B; -006 B; -007 B; -008 B; -009 B; -010 B; -011 B; -012 B; -013 B; -014 B;
 - Planning Design and Access Statement;
 - Lifetime Homes Statement;
 - Sustainability Statement.
 - 3) No development shall take place until the details of the design of the dormer windows including elevation and section drawings at 1:10 scale have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
 - 4) No development shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.
-

Procedural Matters

2. The application was refused for three reasons, two of which related to the absence of a planning obligation under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This was sought by the Council to address the provision of a construction management plan and car free residential units. A signed and dated agreement was presented with the appeal. I am satisfied that this Agreement meets the test of paragraph 122 of the CIL Regulations 2010 and resolves two of the Council's reasons for refusing the application. I have therefore taken it into account in my determination of the appeal.
3. At the time of my site visit construction works were in progress and the building was encased in scaffolding and sheeting. However, I was able to see the building in the surrounding context and detailed drawings were submitted with the appeal. Although the building was not fully visible the evidence provided, together with my observations on the site visit, has enabled me to determine the appeal.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a Victorian, four-storey terraced building, with a basement, on the north-eastern corner of the junction of Charlotte Street and Tottenham Street. It is currently being refurbished and converted into a predominantly residential building of six apartments following the granting of planning permission on appeal, Ref: APP/X5210/A/13/2198369. A further application to extend the building at roof level to provide an additional three bedroom apartment was submitted in 2014, Ref: 2014/5073/P. This was dismissed on appeal, Ref: APP/X5210/W/14/3001661.
6. The site lies within the Charlotte Street Conservation Area. In assessing the effect of the proposal I therefore have a duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that Area. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss requires clear and convincing justification. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) also advises that any harm which is less than substantial, must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal.
7. The Conservation Area is characterised by a densely developed grid pattern of narrow streets flanked by terraces of properties which date from the 18th century. They include a variety of age and style of buildings including Georgian, Regency, Victorian and more modern development. The Charlotte Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan indicates that No 64 makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Area.
8. No 64 is a prominent, well-proportioned building of individual character with stucco walls and a low parapet roof. Its fenestration detailing, which is currently being refurbished, is particularly attractive and makes a significant contribution to the conservation area as an historic asset. The distinctive façades give rise to a visual separation between No 64 and the adjoining terraces. Although these are also four-storey they appear subservient to the corner property, due to their plain brick façades and more modest fenestration

- details. The appeal property also contrasts with two of the other corner properties, which are modern buildings and are both taller than No 64.
9. However, in several ways No 64 mirrors the building on the diagonally opposite corner of the junction, No 69; it is similarly proportioned, has stucco walls and almost identical fenestration detailing. Elsewhere along both streets there are a variety of older and more modern buildings. These vary in height and some, including No 69, have incorporated mansard roofs. Furthermore, in views from any direction approaching the Charlotte Street/Tottenham Street junction, the building is seen in the context of taller buildings which sit beyond it, whether they are either on another corner or further down the street.
 10. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document: *Camden Planning Guidance 1 – Design* (CPG1), advises that roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where there is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group. Alterations should be architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form. Roof additions are unacceptable where groups of buildings have a largely unimpaired roof line.
 11. The appeal proposal is for a mansard roof extension which would wrap around the building and would only be set back from the parapet by a parapet gutter. However, it would have a traditional appearance, with a 70 degree pitch from the parapet. It would not disrupt an unimpeded or uniform terrace and would be seen in the context of the wide variety of heights and roof forms in the immediately surrounding area. It would also have some similarity of form and materials to the mansard roof extension which has been constructed at No 69, although it would be larger. It seems to me that the scheme would appear subservient to the host building and the adjacent buildings and in these respects would comply with the advice of CPG1.
 12. The current proposal seeks to address the Inspector's main reason for rejecting the previous scheme, which related to the fenestration details. The revised scheme would include a series of dormer windows that would be traditional in their style and detailing. All but one of the windows facing Tottenham Street would align with the windows immediately below and would therefore primarily be a reflection of the number on that elevation. The alignment of the two dormers on the Charlotte Street elevation with the piers in the façade below would ensure that they relate appropriately to that elevation without dominating the roof as a whole.
 13. Although the dormers would not be significantly smaller than those in the previous scheme, their detailing has been amended and would include 2x3 panes set in timber sliding sash windows. The simple detailing, including the narrow timber architrave and lead cladding would ensure that they conform to the principle of diminishing proportions of the existing windows in the host property. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed windows would not appear unduly prominent or out of keeping with the host property or other nearby buildings.
 14. Taking all these factors into consideration I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area. It would comply with Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Development Policies. These policies, amongst other things, require development to be of the highest standard of design. Proposals must also take into account the character, setting, context,

scale and proportions of the host property and those of neighbouring buildings, especially in areas protected for their historic interest. The proposal would also accord with the Framework's advice to conserve historic assets in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit I have imposed a condition specifying the plans and documents in the interests of certainty. The Council suggested a matching materials condition. However, the materials to be used in the mansard extension will be different from those on the existing elevations and insufficient details about them were provided on the application form to provide clarity about their suitability. I also note that in allowing the previous appeal my colleague required details of the windows to be subject to a pre-commencement condition. For the sake of precision and consistency I have therefore imposed conditions to agree details of the windows and the materials to be used in the external surfaces in order to safeguard the appearance of the building and the character of the conservation area.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.

Sheila Holden

INSPECTOR