

TR STUDIO
ARCHITECTURE + INTERIORS

9 White Lion Street
London
N1 9PD

t: 0203 771 8454
e: office@trstudio.co.uk

14/11/2016

The Planning Inspectorate

Crown Buildings
Cathays Park
Cardiff
CF10 3NQ

Re: 23 Healey Street, London NW1 8SR

Planning Ref: 2016/4729/P (Refused by Camden Council)

Dear Sir/ Madam

We hereby submit a case against the recent refusal by Camden Council for planning permission to the above mentioned property.

The host property is not Listed, nor is it in a Conservation Area.

The application was refused, under delegated powers on 03.10.2016. The reason for refusal stated on the Decision Notice states 'the proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, bulk, height and location within a terrace of largely unimpaired rooflines, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, street scene and surrounding area, contrary to policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy ... and policy DP24 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.'

We disagree with the Council's assessment of the development. We do not think the Council has taken into consideration, and applied appropriate weight to all the material considerations.

The planning history of the parent building and the street are considered to be fundamental to the assessment of the appeal. Consent has recently been granted, on appeal, for a near identical proposal at No.21 Healey Street, the appellant's immediate neighbour. (**Appeal Ref:** APP/X5210/D/16/3147399). A copy of the appeal decision is provided in Appendix 01 (refer to supporting information attached as part of Appeal submission).

It is considered that the LPA has not given appropriate weight to the overturn for a strikingly similar proposal immediately next door.

APPEAL STATEMENT

The Inspector for the appeal at No.21 concluded that the street did have other additions and extensions at roof level and that the proposal would sit comfortably within its context.

The development and the reasoning for allowing the appeal is a material consideration due to the cumulative impact of the adjoining sites within the street scene.

The appeal seeks an almost identical layout, bulk and massing as the scheme at No.21. The two developments together would further integrate into the run of terraced properties.

The Inspector at No.21 Healey Street concluded that the proposal would not harm the character or appearance of the area and that the rear of Healey Street is not prominent in wider views and therefore, the proposed development would appear 'neither dominant nor incongruous' but would form 'one of a number of subordinate changes to the rear of the terrace.'

As the Inspector during the appeal at No.21 Healey Street observed, 'many dwellings have been extended or altered, especially at the rear, where there are numerous extensions of various shapes, sizes and forms.' The majority of these are 'subordinate to the host property and due to the overall height and massing of the terrace, do not appear unduly dominant or intrusive.'

The Inspector goes on to state 'the various alterations apparent along Healy 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.'

The Inspector concluded that '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.'

The development, the subject of this appeal, in a similar fashion to that allowed at No.21, would ensure that the front façade remains visibly unaltered as, to some considerable degree, the existing additions and alterations are obscured from view from the street level.

A sensitive design approach, one that we have strived to achieve, to ensure we do not cause any harm to the streetscape, would mean views of the proposed roof extension from upper floors of houses on the opposite side of the street would be of a modest, modern and attractive feature, that would be low in height and would sit comfortably within the surrounding roofscape.

It has been established during the course of the previous appeal that the roofline isn't 'unaltered.' The extant permission at No.21, although yet to be implemented, is a material consideration in the context of the site. The

APPEAL STATEMENT

Council note in their delegated report that Policy CPG1 advises on the acceptability of mansard additions where it is an established roof form within a group of buildings yet this policy does not for part of the reason for refusal.

As observed by the previous Inspector, Nos.15 & 25 Healey Street, have been extended at roof level and as such, the roofline is altered.

The proposal at No.23 would be nestled amongst an already altered roof profile, which would not lead to any significant harm in itself or cumulatively within the streetscape.

The overall design by way of the materials used and the common form of a mansard roof, would allow the proposal at No.23 to appear in keeping with its surroundings.

A previous appeal at No.23 was dismissed in September 2016. The Council erroneously state in their delegated report that the 'circumstances have not changed since here in terms of the policy of the site context'.

The design of this proposal is different from that now the subject of this appeal. Furthermore, it is evident in the Inspector's decision that they were not aware of the proposal at No.21. Whilst the differing appeal decision on neighbouring sites at similar timings is unusual, the Inspectors were unaware of the neighbouring proposals and as such, the situation is now fundamentally different. The conflicting appeal decisions at neighbouring sites is a difficult situation to interpret and it would appear that the Council are giving more weight to the dismissal at no.23 rather than the allowed appeal at no.21 as they consider it to support their stance. However, the conclusions made by the Inspector at no.21 must be given considerable weight, particularly in light of the changes to the scheme at no.23 to further reflect the allowed development.

It would seem that the Council do not agree with the appeal decision at no.21 and as such are giving it very little weight in their decision making even going so far as to say 'if the mansard roof extension at no.21 were built, it is not considered that the resultant harm to the unimpaired roofline can be used as a justification for further harm which would undoubtedly result in another mansard extension next door'. The Council argue that even with additions at nos. 15, 21 and 25, the roofline would still remain largely unimpaired. This is in direct conflict with the conclusions reached by the Inspector at no.21 and fails to be consistent in the decision making process. We would also further emphasise that the Council's main policy on the acceptability to otherwise of mansard roof additions, namely policy CPG1, is not named on the decision notice as a reason for refusal.

We would share the previous Inspector's thoughts at no. 21 that roof additions form part of the context on both the East & West sides of the host street. As noted by the Inspector at no.21, no. 14 Healey Street also has a roof addition. This was also granted on appeal.

APPEAL STATEMENT

The proposal at No.23 Healey Street bears similarities to the mansard development at No.14, both in terms of being low in height and lightweight in appearance and that, from street level, a subordinate addition such as that at no.14 remained largely hidden from view and unobtrusive.

In conclusion, and taking into consideration the relevant history in and around this particular application, previous iterations and neighbouring examples, the proposed development would not harm the character and appearance of the area. Neither do we feel, that the development is contrary to the Framework, to Core Strategy policy CS14, to LDF policy DP24, or to Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 (2015), which together amongst other things, protect local character and allow development that responds well to its context and site characteristics.

We respectfully request that the Secretary of State allows the appeal.

Yours Sincerely,

Helen Thomas

TR STUDIO