



---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2013

**by S N Hand MA**

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

**Decision date: 22 February 2013**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/13/2191399**  
**23 Cliff Villas, London, NW1 9AT**

- 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 Stuart Anderson against the decision of London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2012/5173/P was refused by notice dated 23 November 2012.
  - The development proposed is erection of additional storey at second floor level with mansard roof at third level following removal of second floor mansard and third floor lantern extension to dwelling house (Class C3).
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for erection of additional storey at second floor level with mansard roof at third level following removal of second floor mansard and third floor lantern extension to dwelling house (Class C3) at 23 Cliff Villas, London, NW1 9AT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2012/5173/P, dated 20 September 2012, and the plans submitted with it, 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: PL-004; PL-005; all dated January 2012.
  - 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.

## Main issue

2. The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

## Reasons

3. An appeal for a similar development was refused in 2012. That proposal was to replace the mansard second floor, with a straight copy of the first floor, surmounted by a new mansard, in place of the existing lantern structure. The Inspector considered the new mansard was acceptable, but the proposed second floor would be built flush with the face of the neighbouring building, thus obscuring the attractive stone quoins. This appeal proposal has the

- second floor set back to reveal the quoins, but is otherwise similar to the original proposal.
4. Camden Square Conservation Area lies across the road, with long terraces of uniform Georgian buildings, but the appeal site lies amongst a more eclectic mix of styles, including a large, modern, petrol filling station to one side and a substantial Georgian villa attached to the other. The Georgian villa is one of a row of three villas, all quite different to each other in design. The appeal site is an existing house, set at an angle to the villa and of a quite different scale and design. The existing mansard roof is surmounted by a very odd looking glass-sided lantern, and both the appeal proposal and the previous design represent an improvement over the existing hodge-podge of structures, returning a sense of design uniformity to the building which is more typical of the traditional buildings in the immediate vicinity.
  5. The set back now allows the stone quoins to be seen, which I agree, is an improvement over the original. To some extent I share the Council's view that revealing more brickwork around the quoins would further enhance their impact and improve the look of the flank wall that remains visible. I also agree that there are no other buildings in the area with a second floor horizontal set-back, such as that proposed here, however I think these are both minor quibbles. There are a number of end terrace buildings in the area, where the finish of the final building creates a series of vertical set-backs, unusual angles and different roof treatments. Add to this the already unusual relationship of the appeal building to its neighbour and the relatively minor changes introduced by this proposal, will, in this context, be hardly noticeable.
  6. I also consider the overall impact of the proposal will be positive, improving the look of the end of this terrace by tidying up the roofscape and creating a greater sense of uniformity. Consequently, I do not think the proposal harms the character and appearance of the area, and actually represents a small benefit. It follows that the setting of the nearby Conservation Area is preserved and the proposal is in accord with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010.
  7. I shall attach the standard conditions for commencement, plans and matching materials.

*S Hand*

INSPECTOR