
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 September 2016

by Jason Whitfield BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 20th October 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3149545

191 Brecknock Road, Camden, London N19 5AB

- 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 and Mrs Peter Beecham against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2015/5786/P, dated 28 October 2015, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2016.
 - The development proposed is a rear extension and rear dormer.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a rear extension at first and second floor level, alteration to second floor rear window and installation of 1x rooflight to rear roofslope at 191 Brecknock Road, Camden, London N19 5AB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2015/5786/P, dated 28 October 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: 268 Loc 01, 268 SU01, 268 SU02, 268 SU03, 268 SU04, 268 SU05, 268 SU06, 268 P01 Rev B, 268 P03 Rev B, 268 P04 Rev B, 268 P05 Rev C, 268 P06 Rev B and 268 P07 Rev C.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Preliminary Matters

2. The description in the heading above is taken from the application form. The appeal form provides a revised description which matches that of the Council's decision notice. It is a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and I have, therefore, determined the appeal on that basis.
 3. The proposal was amended following submission to the Council but prior to its determination. The changes, as shown on amended plans, omit a previously proposed dormer window and are relatively minor in nature such that the overall substance of the proposal has not changed. I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced by my consideration of the amended scheme. I have, therefore, determined the appeal on that basis.
-

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is a three-storey terraced property which has been converted into two self-contained flats. The property has an original two-storey rear addition which has a mono-pitch roof and is paired with the adjacent property. Such additions are found in a relatively uniform pattern throughout the terrace. There is an existing flat roofed extension within the roof plane of the rear addition and an adjacent first floor balcony.
6. It is proposed to erect an extension to the rear between the first and second floors of the property. The extension would replace the existing flat roofed extension within the roof of the rear addition. It would provide an enlarged shower and utility room on the first floor and create a bathroom on the second floor.
7. Camden Planning Guidance - Design 2015 (CPG1) states that, in most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged. It also goes on to state that extensions should be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing. The maximum acceptable height of an extension should have regard to those factors and where higher extensions are appropriate, a smaller footprint would be preferable.
8. I note that the extension would have a height in excess of the guidance set out in CPG1 and would be larger than the existing extension. It would also extend above the sill of a second floor window, leaving the window truncated. However, the extension would remain substantially below the eaves of the main roof. Moreover, it would sit below the ridge of the two-storey back addition, whilst the existing chimney stack on the rear of the property would be retained. Furthermore, it would project no further than the existing first floor balcony and a considerable proportion of the roof on the back addition would be retained.
9. I note that the extension would be visible from neighbouring windows and gardens. However, those views would be seen in the context of several properties which have been extended and altered, several of which include somewhat obtrusive and bulky dormer window extensions. Moreover, the extension would not be visible within the street scene of Brecknock Road and views from the public realm would be considerably limited.
10. As a result, I consider the extension would not result in any significant increase of mass or bulk on the rear of the property and it would appear subordinate to the existing building. Moreover, it would not harm the uniformity of the host building or the terrace. It would therefore meet several objectives in the CPG1 and would meet the key message of the guidance that alterations should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings.
11. I conclude, therefore, that the proposal would not have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, the proposal would not

conflict with Policies CS5 and CS14 of the Core Strategy¹ which seek to provide spaces of the highest quality and the highest standards of design. It would also comply with Policy DP24 of the Development Policies² which states that all extensions to existing buildings should be of the highest standard of design.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I consider a condition relating to the approved plans necessary to provide certainty. I also consider a condition requiring matching materials to be used necessary in to prevent any harmful effects on the character and appearance of the area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

Jason Whitfield

INSPECTOR

¹ Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 Local Development Framework 2010

² Camden Development Policies 2010-2025 Local Development Framework 2010