
Appeal Decision

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 23 January 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/16/3157658

Flat C, 166 Arlington Road, London NW1 7HP

- 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 Ms Sandra Nicholls against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/3467/P, dated 21 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 16 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is conversion of the existing loft space to accommodate a rear roof terrace and internal alterations of the first and second floor.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and on the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in the Camden Town Conservation Area (CA). The Council's CA Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS) divides the CA into two character sub areas: a commercial area and a residential area. The CAAMS states that the CA has a high proportion of 19th century buildings which make a positive contribution to the historic character and appearance of the CA and that the east side of Arlington Road is less uniform than the western side with residential uses interspersed with commercial uses. The appeal site together with its immediate neighbours at 162 & 164 Arlington Road is identified as a positive building within the CA.
 4. The appeal site comprises the upper two floors of a traditional three storey plus basement, double fronted terraced property. The host building is largely constructed from brick with some elements of render to the side and rear with the prominent front elevation being largely unaltered and incorporating period features. The rear elevation is less uniform in design and appearance and incorporates an existing second floor terrace above a flat roofed rear outrigger enclosed by a mixture of brick walls and timber fencing. The rear elevation of the host building is adjacent to and backs onto the rear elevations of other nearby properties on Arlington Road and Parkway with views of it being limited to from nearby properties and limited views from the public car park off
-

- Underhill Street. The traditional roof form of the host building appears to be largely unaltered.
5. The proposed second floor extension would extend out from the existing rear elevation, partially across the existing second floor terrace to meet the rear elevation of the adjoining property at No 164. A new roof terrace is proposed above the second floor extension, to be accessed via a new stairway and large hinged rooflight that would be positioned across the eaves of the host building and would cut into the unaltered rear roof slope. In addition the height of the parapet wall between Nos 164 & 166 would be increased and glazed balustrading would be provided above the new terrace.
 6. The position and height of the proposed second floor rear extension together with its relatively narrow width compared to the wider rear elevation means that I do not share the Council's concerns that it would not be subservient to the host building or that it would adversely affect the relationship with Nos 162 & 164. However whilst the rear elevation of the host building is not prominent I consider that the formation of the proposed new roof terrace and the associated alterations would result in unsympathetic alterations and visual clutter to the simple, unaltered roof and would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building.
 7. Though the appellant has drawn my attention to other roof alterations in the immediate area, some of which exist, I am not aware of the details or particular circumstances relating to these cases. In any event whilst these existing alterations comprise part of the character of the area I must determine the proposal before me on its own merits and do not consider that the other examples justify the proposal.
 8. Having regard to the fact that the host building makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA and to the fact that the roof alterations would be visible from some limited vantage points within the CA, I consider that the harm to the significance of the CA would be less than substantial. As I have found harm to the significance of the CA, having regard to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), this harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst I note that the proposal would provide additional and improved living space this does not equate to a public benefit that would outweigh the harm identified.
 9. In reaching my decision I note that the proposal would not alter the front elevation of the host building and that it is an amended scheme following the refusal of a previous application for a rear extension that was dismissed at appeal (Ref 2014/7574/P). Though I am not aware of the particular details or circumstances relating to the previously refused application, I note that in submitting the proposal the appellant sought to address the previous concerns raised. However for the reasons stated, I consider the proposal to be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building and the CA.
 10. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the host building and on the surrounding area. It is therefore contrary to the development plan and in particular Policy CS14 of the Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies. These policies

require, amongst other things, development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and preserves and enhances Camden's heritage assets.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I hereby conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR