

Grounds of Appeal - Householder Planning Appeal at 31 Mackeson Road, London NW3 2LU

London Borough of Camden Application
Reference: 2016/6351/P

Appellant: Mr & Mrs Kirkpatrick
Agent: Planology Ltd

JANUARY 2017



PLANOLOGY

REPORT PREPARED BY:

JOANNA LEEK MSc(Hons) DipTCP MRTPI
ON BEHALF OF PLANOLOGY LTD

PLANOLOGY LTD

joannaleek@planology.co.uk

www.planology.co.uk

PROJECT: 2016-JB55 MACKESON ROAD

DATE: 27 JANUARY 2017

Contents

1.0 Introduction & Background

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Document Structure

1.3 Site Background

1.4 Proposals

2.0 Grounds of Appeal

2.1 Reason for Refusal

2.2 Response to Reason for Refusal

3.0 Conclusions

3.1 Conclusions

APPENDIX 1 - CAAC RESPONSE

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 This Grounds of Appeal Statement is prepared by Planology Ltd on behalf of Mr & Mrs Kirkpatrick (“the Appellant”) in response to the decision of London Borough of Camden (“the Council”) to refuse the application for ‘Variation of Condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission reference 2016/0451/P dated 31/03/16 (erection of single storey side/rear infill extension and rear dormer window with associated roof terrace) namely to install a glazed infill structure between the approved side and rear ground floor extensions.’ (“the proposed development”) at 31 Mackeson Road, London NW3 2LU (“the Appeal site”) on 25th January 2017 (Council’s reference: 2016/6351/P).
- 1.1.2 The planning application was submitted and validated by the Council on 21st November 2016. Consultation ended on 23rd December 2016. The decision was issued on 25th January 2017.

1.2 Document Structure

- 1.2.1 This statement provides a description of the background to the planning application and appeal, and sets out the Appellant’s response to the reason for refusal.
- 1.2.2 The statement is set out as follows;
- A description of the background and proposed development;
 - Response to the reason for refusal; and
 - Conclusions for consideration by the Planning Inspector.

1.3 Site Background

- 1.3.1 The Appeal site comprises 31 Mackeson Road, London NW3 2LU (figure 1.1 and 1.2). It is a 3-storey Victorian terraced property with a rear garden.
- 1.3.2 The property is located within the Mansfield Conservation Area. It is not statutory listed.



Figure 1.1: SITE LOCATION PLAN



Figure 1.2: PHOTO OF 31 MACKESON ROAD (FRONT)

1.4 Proposals

- 1.4.1 The proposals are for the variation of condition 3 of the approved planning permission (LB Camden Ref: 2016/0906/P) which was granted consent in March 2016 for the “Erection of single side/rear infill extension and rear dormer window with associated roof terrace” at the appeal site. The proposed variation seeks to install a glazed infill structure between the approved side and rear ground floor extensions.
- 1.4.2 During the original application the plans were revised to accommodate the case officer’s view that a ‘wrap-around’ extension would detract from the original building. The final approved scheme therefore consisted of a side extension and a rear extension resulting in ‘gap’ in-between the two extended areas to maintain views of the original corner of host building (figure 1.3).
- 1.4.3 This configuration on the ground floor plan however has resulted in an awkward layout and as such the Appellant’s explored ways in which the corner could be incorporated into the ground floor whilst still maintaining the form of the original property and meeting policy requirements.
- 1.4.4 The result from numerous design iterations by the project architects was to enclose the corner with a completely glazed infill, thereby providing good internal layout but also preserving the host buildings design, proportion and form (figure 1.4).
- 1.4.5 The applicant is committed to construction of the approved side and rear extensions which are likely to commence in April of this year however it does not preclude incorporating this fully glazed corner if it were to be allowed by this appeal. The appeal scheme is very much the preferred option because it provides significantly better quality accommodation and a better overall design solution for the rear elevation.



Figure 1.3: 3D SKETCH SHOWING APPROVED SCHEME (2016/0906/P)



Figure 1.4: 3D SKETCH SHOWING PROPOSED GLASS INFILL

2.0 Grounds of Appeal

2.1 Reasons for Refusal

- 2.1.1 The planning application was refused for one reason, as set out in the decision notice dated 25th January 2017:
- 2.1.2 Reason 1: “The size, design and location of the proposed infill extension is considered to undermine the architectural integrity of the host property, harming its appearance and the uniformity of the neighbouring rear elevations, to the detriment of the special character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing High Quality Design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden’s Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.”

2.2 Response to Reason for Refusal 1

- 2.2.1 As set out in the planning statement accompanying the application the Appellant undertook pre-application discussions with case officers who confirmed that they felt the retention of the gap between the two approved extensions was important to maintain views of the corner of the host property to preserve the original character of the property and surrounding Conservation Area.
- 2.2.2 This was the main design driver for the use of glazing rather than a solid material as it immediately results in a lightweight structure and keeps it in line with what has already been approved. The transparency of the proposals means that the original form of the rear elevation of the property can still be read and is preserved, whilst allowing for a much improved internal layout and a high quality design solution for the rear elevation (figure 2.1).



THIS SKETCH ILLUSTRATES HOW THE ORIGINAL CORNER OF THE HOST BUILDING WILL BE PRESERVED, THEREBY PRESERVING ITS OVERALL ORIGINAL FORM, APPEARANCE AND CHARACTER.

Figure 2.1: 3D SKETCH SHOWING PROPOSED MINOR MATERIAL ALTERATION - SHOWING HOW THE CORNER OF THE HOST BUILDING IS PRESERVED



EXAMPLE OF HOW THE PROJECT ARCHITECTS RECENTLY USED A HIGH QUALITY GLAZED EXTENSION AT A LISTED PROPERTY AND HOW IT IS POSSIBLE TO STILL VIEW THE ORIGINAL HOST BUILDING AND PRESERVE ITS FORM

2.2.3 It was also noted in the planning statement that there are a number of nearby examples where similar extension have been permitted, both historically and more recently. The case officer discounts some of these in his report however they all make up the character of the wider area and demonstrate that these properties are not all preserved 'in-situ' as is being put forward by the Council.

2.2.4 The examples identified were (Figure 2.2):

- Numerous properties on Cressy Road, the most recently approved being no.13 (LBC Ref: 2015/6192/P) where in the case officer's report it sets out; "Whilst the single storey rear extension would wrap around the existing closet wing to the rear of the property, it would be similar in size and design to neighbouring extensions in the area. Therefore, the proposed scheme overall is considered not to harm the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding conservation area."
- Numerous properties on Savernake Road, notably no.38 located opposite the Grade II listed All Hallows Church. The approved extension (LBC Ref: 2010/6821/P) projects along the side of the rear closet wing and

wraps around the rear elevation. In the officers report they cited no.30 Cressy Road as a precedent example, and concluded that the use of glazing and a lightweight design were considered to reduce the visual bulk of the addition, and that it would respect the form and proportion of the original house.

- Numerous properties on Constantine Road, most recently granted was an application at no.135 (LBC Ref: 2016/2711/P) for a full wrap around rear/side extension. Reasons for granting permission, as set out in the officers decision notice included; that the extension would be subordinate to the host dwelling and would be in-keeping in terms of scale and form with similar developments carried out at nos. 133,137 and 139.
- 2.2.5 All of these examples set out are in the immediately adjacent streets and within the same part of the Mansfield Conservation Area. We also noted there are some examples on Mackeson Road (these are the two examples specifically discounted in the officers report);
- The dwelling at no.11 has a full width and return infill conservatory, permitted development for this was confirmed in 1998

(LBC Ref: PE9800641). The case officer states that this example is considered over dominant and unsympathetic; however our reasoning for using it as an example was to demonstrate that there is variation to the rear elevations and that the proposals put forward with this application (now appeal) are of a much higher quality and seek to preserve the form of the host property.

- A number of other properties on the street have had approved rear side infill extensions right up to the end of the rear building line, including No. 7 Mackeson Road (LBC Ref: 2009/4720/P) which resulted in a full width extension with no set backs from rear building line and it was considered that host building was not unduly affected. Again the case officer discounts this example as its projects less than 1m beyond the closet wing, but this shows that the Council accept a wrap around principle, and the proposals for 31 Mackeson Road clearly keep the original form of the property visible so will be of lesser impact to the historic form than that permitted here at no.7.



Figure 2.2: AERIAL VIEWS OVER CONSERVATION AREA SHOWING NUMEROUS WRAP AROUND EXTENSIONS

2.2.6 Local Development Framework Development
Policy DP24 requires all developments including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design. Part (A) of the policy requires developments to consider the character, setting, context and form and scale of the neighbouring buildings; Part (B) requires proposals to consider the character and proportions of the existing building; and Part (C) requires the consideration of the quality of the proposed materials.

2.2.7 Thorough consideration was been given to creating a proposal that is sympathetic and uses high quality materials to integrate the additional extension area into the approved scheme. The detailed assessment of nearby similar extensions confirms that the proposals meet part A of DP24 by respecting the local character, context and form/scale of nearby properties and the wider character of the Conservation Area. The use of full high quality glazing allows the host building to be enhanced and its original form still able to be read and its proportions and character preserved (Figure 2.1), thereby meeting the requirements of parts B and C of policy DP24.

2.2.8 Policy DP25 focuses more in detail on the preservation and enhancement of Camden's Conservation Areas, and seeks to only permit development that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As this proposal would not be visible from the public realm its impact will be limited, and it is more assessed in the context of private views and in terms of historic patterns and forms. The Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (adopted in December 2008) states that "The original historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area and as such rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would diverge significantly from the historic pattern." It is clear from the examples cited there is large degree of variation not only in the wider Conservation Area but also along Mackeson Road that this level of extension/ alteration would not diverge significantly from the historic and emerging pattern. Again the use of a fully glazed element would keep the scale very similar to that of the approved scheme and would maintain views of the original property, thereby preserving the

character and appearance of the Mansfield Conservation Area and complying with policy DP25.

2.2.9 The proposed minor alterations are creating a development which is of high design and material quality, do not have any adverse impacts on neighbouring occupiers and seek to preserve the character and appearance of the host property and the wider Mansfield Conservation Area, and is therefore in accordance the National Planning Policy Framework, the London Plan, and both London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

2.2.10 It is also very much worth noting feedback (redacted) from the Mansfield Conservation Area Advisory Committee which states that they are in 'support' and 'have no objection to this change'. (response including in Appendix 1)

3.0 Conclusions

3.1 Conclusions

- 3.1.1 The proposals do not have any adverse impacts on any neighbouring occupiers, as confirmed by the Council.
- 3.1.2 The proposals are in line with similar proposals in the immediate vicinity of the site.
- 3.1.3 The proposals are of a high quality design and enhance the rear elevation of the property, retain the ability to read the original form of the property and preserve the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 3.1.4 In conclusion the proposals fully comply with the development plan policy and we respectfully request the Inspector allows the appeal.

APPENDIX 1 -

CAAC RESPONSE

Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 20816201

Planning Application Details

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------|
| Year | 2016 |
| Number | 6351 |
| Letter | P |
| Planning application address | 31 mackeson road |
| | |
| Title | Mr. |
| Your First Name | steven |
| Initial | |
| Last Name | adams |
| Organisation | mcaac |
| Comment Type | Support |
| | |
| Postcode | NW3 2JA |
| Address line 1 | 6 Rona Road |
| Address line 2 | LONDON |
| Address line 3 | |
| Postcode | NW3 2JA |

Your comments on the planning application We have no objection to this change.

If you wish to upload a file containing your comments then use the link below

No files attached

About this form