

APPEAL STATEMENT

CLIENT:	R. MCGOVERN
PROJECT:	FLAT 2, 191 FORDWYCH ROAD, LONDON, NW2 3NH
PROJECT NUMBER:	A17-003
DOCUMENT NUMBER:	AP1
DOCUMENT SIZE:	A4
DATE:	JUNE 2017
ISSUE STATUS:	Planning
REVISION:	

PREPARED BY:

Justin Smith Architects
5 Queen Street, Derby, DE1 3DL
Tel: 01332 460044
Email: mail@justinsmitharchitects.co.uk
Web: www.justinsmitharchitects.co.uk

CONTENTS

1.0 Introduction 1

2.0 Appeal Site & Surroundings 1

3.0 The Proposal 1

4.0 Reasons for refusal 1

5.0 Policy Context 2

6.0 Conclusion..... 2

1.0 Introduction

This statement is prepared in support of an appeal on behalf of Mr Rob McGovern against the refusal of planning permission by Camden borough Council for the erection of a two-storey rear extension to 191 Fordwych Road, London.

2.0 Appeal Site & Surroundings

The appeal site is located at 191 Fordwych Road within the North-West London Borough of Camden. The sites location benefits from good connections to local amenities, with its proximity to Cricklewood and connective links to central London.

The building is typical Victorian semi-detached housing stock which has been converted into 3 individual flats. Access to the appeal property (Flat 2) is via a shared stairwell at first floor level. There is access via the side of No.191, although as this is not under the ownership of the appellant, agreement is obtained via the neighbour.

Flat 2 is situated to the rear of the building (191) and includes accommodation at ground floor and first floor level, together with the rear garden.

The surrounding character of neighbouring buildings consists largely of a residential context with several Victorian villas which have either been similarly converted into flats or remain as semidetached dwellings. Most the building stock has been renovated and extended through roof dormers, side and rear extensions.

The main materiality feature of the street scene consists of traditional red brick, render, slate roofs, along with Victorian detailing on window cills, lintels, decorated eaves treatments and two storey bay windows.

However, the appeal property, being situated at the rear, does not address the street scene of 191 Fordwych Road as it is situated wholly to the rear of the property. As the rear of the property is bounded by the Midland Mainline Railway, it is difficult to see the rear of the property from anywhere within the public domain.

3.0 The Proposal

The proposal is for a two-storey extension to the rear of 191 Fordwych Road, wholly on the land of Flat 2. The ground floor extension replaces a current flat roofed extension. It could be argued that if the Victorian property had not been converted to flats, then the ground floor addition would be classed as permitted development.

The first-floor extension is proposed to be modest in size 3m x 4m with a 45-degree cut off to accommodate the right of light from the neighbouring property. The styling is modern and articulate in its detailing. By virtue of its flat roofed design, the scale is sub-ordinate to the existing height of the Victorian roof.

4.0 Reasons for refusal

The local authority has refused planning permission based on only one point:

“The proposed two-storey rear extension, because of its detailed design, bulk, scale and siting, would fail to appear as a subordinate addition to the host building and would appear incongruous in the context of the existing rear elevation and surroundings which would be detrimental to the appearance of the host building. It would be contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and emerging policy and D1.

5.0 Policy Context

Paragraph 60 of the NPPF states planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Whilst we agree with reinforcing local distinctiveness, in this case it is hard to re-inforce if the proposal is not visible in the public domain.

We disagree that the proposal is incongruous, as we have already stated the NPPF states that “planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles.”

We disagree that the bulk, scale and siting is inappropriate and propose that it is indeed subordinate to the original building.

We also consider that as the proposal is not within public view, and does not over shadow neighbouring properties.

6.0 Conclusion

This statement has described the proposals, set out the relevant planning policy context and focused on the main material consideration pertinent to the determination of the appeal.

It is considered the proposal is an original design that will result in a high-quality development of design with sufficient area and quality of outdoor amenity space for the intended purpose. The proposals would not have an over bearing nor over shadowing effect on neighboring properties, nor appear cramped in relation to their surroundings.

It is therefore respectfully requested that the appeal is allowed.