

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 August 2016

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/16/3154056

1e Parsifal Road, London, NW6 1UG

- 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 Julien Leonard against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/1622/P, dated 23 March 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 June 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single-storey roof extension with a roof terrace to the rear, external staircase from the roof terrace to first floor level, and associated alterations including the insertion of new windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues in this case are the effect of the proposed roof and other alterations on:
 - The character and appearance of the area around Parsifal Road and Lyncroft Gardens, and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of nearby properties by way of light, privacy and outlook.

Reasons

3. No 1e Parsifal Road is a two-storey detached house situated on a backland plot, between Parsifal Road and Lyncroft Gardens. It has further accommodation in the basement and a large single-storey rear extension. The rear extension appears to have a balcony on its flat roof with a balustrade around and "cane" privacy screens to each side. In common with the adjoining No 1f, it has a flat roof and is aligned approximately north-east to south-west. The slope of the surrounding land is such that No 1f and the properties to the south-east are at a slightly lower level.
 4. The proposed development would involve the construction of a curved, mansard-style roof over most of the dwelling, to enable the provision of more living accommodation in the roof space. There would be two windows in each of the north-west and south-east facing elevations and one window in each of the other two elevations. There would also be a small balcony at the current roof
-

level with a spiral staircase down to the existing balcony. Finally, there would be timber privacy screens to the south-eastern side of the proposed balconies and spiral staircase.

Character and appearance

5. The Council contends that the proposed roof terrace and associated railings, privacy screen and staircase, by reason of their design, location and visual prominence, would appear as incongruous additions resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the host building. The Council accepts that the new roof, in itself, would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the building, and I concur with that view. However, the creation of a second floor balcony with balustrade and timber privacy screen, together with the addition of a spiral staircase and further timber privacy screens to the side elevation, would result in a cluttered appearance. This would exacerbate the already somewhat unattractive appearance created by the existing privacy screen on the north-west side of the balcony, and would be further detrimental to the otherwise relatively clean lines of the main host building.
6. On this issue, therefore, I find that the proposal would result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building, and would conflict with Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy (CS), which requires development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character, and Policy DP24 of the Council's Local Development Framework Development Policies document (DPD), which requires development to take into consideration the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed.

Living conditions

7. The Council contends that the proposed development, by virtue of its height, bulk and proximity to 1f Parsifal Road, would be overbearing and create an unacceptable sense of enclosure. No 1e has a short length of overlap with the dwelling at No 1f. Thereafter, it extends a considerable distance along the boundary with No 1f as a two-storey dwelling. As such, it has some considerable visual impact on the outlook from the windows in the rear of No 1f and the private amenity area immediately outside of the rear extension at that property. The creation of a second floor above the existing flat roof, coupled with the height and depth of the proposed timber privacy screen, would add significantly to that visual impact and would be detrimental to the outlook from No 1f. I am satisfied that the proposed screens would protect the privacy of the occupiers of No 1f, but this does not outweigh the harm to outlook that would result from the proposal.
8. The appellant contends that the proposal secures the ability for a family in residence in the borough to remain in the dwelling. I have some sympathy with this desire, but the house has already been significantly extended and the further extensions proposed would be harmful to the residential amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring dwellings. I have no evidence before me as to the inadequacy of the appeal property as a family home and, in any case, I do not consider that the additional space generated by the proposal would outweigh the harm to living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties that would result.

9. The appellant has submitted a daylight and sunlight report which indicates that the proposed roof would have limited impact on daylight and sunlight received by windows in neighbouring properties. I acknowledge that the likely impact would be within acceptable limits as set out in British Standards. However, the main issue here relates primarily to outlook, and there would be some effect on daylight, albeit slight, particularly to No 1f and to No 37 Lyncroft Gardens, which merely adds to my concerns regarding the oppressive impact that the roof would have on the residential amenities of the occupiers of No 1f.
10. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1f Parsifal Road by way of outlook. On this basis, it would conflict with Policies CS5 of the Council's CS, and Policy DP26 of its DPD, both of which relate to protecting the amenities of local residents, including protection against harm to amenity by way of overshadowing and outlook.

Conclusion

11. On the basis of the above, I find that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area, by virtue of its detrimental impact on the design context of the host property. Furthermore, I find that it would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1f Parsifal Road by way of outlook. I therefore dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR