



*Land at 15 St Mark's Crescent, London, NW1 7TS*

LPA REF: P2017/4124/P

# **PLANNING APPEAL – WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS**

December 2017

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE NO</b>
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. SITE AND SURROUNDING	5
3. PLANNING POLICY	10
4. PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS	15
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	27

#### **APPENDICES**

A	Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement
B	Photos of the appeal site and surrounding area
C	Planning Application, 15 St Marks Crescent 2017/1604/P
D	Officers email regarding 2017/1604/P
E	Planning Application, 15 St Marks Crescent 2012/2515/P
F	Planning Application, 15 St Marks Crescent 2010/5629/P
G	Camden Local Plan extract
H	Officers report for the appeal scheme 2017/4124/P
I	Camden Planning Guidance 1 and 2
J	Planning application, 31 St Mark's Crescent 2016/7071/P

## 1 Introduction

1.1 On behalf of the appellants, Mr & Mrs Greenwood, Future Planning & Development (FPD) have prepared this Statement of Case in respect of a planning appeal at 15 St Mark's Crescent, London NW1 7TS.

1.2 A planning application was submitted in August 2016 for:

*“Replacement of rear first floor window with single door and erection of balustrade to roof of bay window. Removal of existing first floor balustrade, and replacement of casement door with fanlight window.”*

1.3 The application was refused planning permission on 15 September 2017. The reason for refusal reads:

*“The proposed replacement of window with door and erection of railings at first floor level, by virtue its siting, location and scale, would result in an unsympathetic addition to the host building, that would have an adverse effect of the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached buildings and cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area, contrary to Camden Local Plan policies D1 and D2”*

1.4 This Statement reads as follows:

- Introduction;
- Site and surrounding;
- Planning policy;

- Planning considerations;
- Summary and conclusions.

## 2 Site and Surrounding

- 2.1 The appeal site is located in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and is not listed. The Conservation Area Statement (2002) is contained at **Appendix A**.
- 2.2 The residential property is arranged over two levels at first and second floor. The property was subdivided into two self-contained units in 1983. The proposed works would be to the rear of the property.
- 2.3 It is recognised that the rear elevations of houses within St Mark's Crescent are visible from the public realm and the canal towpath. However, there is an eclectic mix in their appearance and character, and it is this that contributes to this stretch of the Regents Canal and the Conservation Area.
- 2.4 Most properties have been altered in some shape or form. Those that have been extended and altered at the rear are 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15 and 16.
- 2.5 There are an array of structures and enclosures at the end of the rear gardens facing the canal, interspersed by a range of mature trees. These establish the initial character and appearance of this group of houses (**appendix B, figure's 1 & 2**).
- 2.6 There is variation in the colour of the rear elevations and many, if not most have been altered in some shape or form, particularly with new openings and balconies (**appendix B, figure's 3 & 4**). There are examples of similar development as to what is proposed in this planning application (**appendix B, figures 3 & 5**).
- 2.7 Numerous properties have been extended at lower ground floor level which is at 'eye level' when viewed from the tow path. There is no uniform architectural style at the rear and it is this variety that forms the character of this part of the canal and Conservation Area.

## **The Proposal**

- 2.8 The appeal scheme was submitted following the withdrawal of a similar planning application (Ref: 2017/1604/P) (**appendix C**). The appeal proposal seeks to reinstate a traditional fanlight at first floor level. This is currently a fully glazed hinged casement window that functions as a door.
- 2.9 The application relates to matters of detail in the building and not to altering the general proportions of it. There are three key changes to the current application scheme and that which was withdrawn (**appendix C**):
- i. The rear, first floor door to existing terrace to be removed and replaced with a traditional, non-opening fanlight that mirrors that at the neighbouring no.16;
  - ii. The removal of the existing balustrade; and
  - iii. The proposal would result in only a single door opening with the new one replacing that on the existing balcony.
- 2.10 The appellants are currently refurbishing the property and seek to create an opening to improve on residential amenity and outlook. The creation of a door would allow for this as well letting air and light into the property.
- 2.11 It is a maisonette occupying the two upper floors so has very limited amenity space which is a small balcony accessed from the return on the stairs. This is an awkward arrangement as there is an approximate 2 foot step up onto it. It is not possible to put steps in because of it being on the narrow staircase
- 2.12 This window is a fully glazed hinged casement window which acts as a door. The proposal seeks to reinstate a traditional fanlight that would enhance this elevation.

2.13 The application proposes the removal of this balcony because of its unsafe access arrangement. Therefore the substitution of one balustrade for another would be on a like-for-like basis thus maintaining a similar relationship with next door as currently exists.





- 2.14 The applicants would like to introduce the opening so that they can enjoy the canal aspect from within a habitable part of the property, not from a staircase.

### **Planning History**

- 2.15 The appeal scheme was submitted following the withdrawal of a similar planning application (Ref: 2017/1604/P) (**appendix C**) for the 'replacement of rear first floor window with double doors and erection of balustrade to roof of bay window'. This followed comments from the case officer (**appendix D**) who considered that the proposed alterations would degrade the symmetry of the host building and the neighbouring no.16 and suggested a different pattern in the new door and fanlight, to be in keeping with the proportions and style of the original windows on the building.
- 2.16 In 2012 the Council approved an application (2012/2515/P) for the erection of a single storey rear extension with roof terrace enclosed by metal railings and replacement of existing lower ground floor level front window with french doors and alterations to window at rear ground floor level (**appendix E**).



2.17 In 2010 the Council were minded to grant planning permission (2010/5629/P), subject to a S106, for extensive works in the ground floor flat. The application was for:

*Alterations and extensions including new basement extension with rear lightwell, erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level, and extension into front lightwell all in connection with existing garden flat (Class C3).*

2.18 The application was subsequently withdrawn (**appendix F**).

2.19 The change of use to two self-contained dwelling units including works of conversion was approved in 1983 (J10/9/19/36766).

### 3 Planning Policy

3.1 The relevant policy documents are the NPPF, London Plan (2016), the Camden Local Plan (2017, Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance and Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2000).

3.2 At paragraph 58 the **NPPF** states:

*“Planning policies and decisions should aim to ensure that developments:*

*...*

- *Respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation.”*

3.3 Paragraph 126 states that Local Planning Authorities (LPA's) should provide a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. It further states that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

3.4 Paragraph 127 states that in designating a conservation area LPA's should ensure that an area justifies such status based on its special architectural or historic interest, and it is not devalued through the designation of areas that lack special interest.

3.5 In considering the impact of development on a designated heritage asset paragraph 132 requires LPA's to place great weight to the asset's conservation, and the greater the importance of an asset the greater the weight should be given.

3.6 Where development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated asset, the harm should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.

- 3.7 At paragraphs 188 to 195 pre-application engagement and front loading is considered. It is recognised that this can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of planning. It encourages a pro-active approach in order to assist LPA's to ensure that applicants do not experience unnecessary delays and costs.
- 3.8 The **London Plan** is the Mayor's spatial development strategy and LPA's are required to keep their local development documents to be in general conformity with it.
- 3.9 Policy 2.15 deals with town centres and states that they should be the main foci beyond the Central Activities Zone for intensification including residential. They should provide the structure for sustaining and improving a choice of goods and services accessible to all Londoners particularly by public transport, cycling and walking. It further recognises that housing growth should be accommodated through intensification and selective expansion in appropriate locations.
- 3.10 Policy 3.3 recognises the pressing need for more homes in London. Policy 3.4 seeks to optimise housing potential and requires planning decisions to take account of local context and character, and to have regard to table 3.2 'Sustainable residential quality density matrix (habitable rooms and dwellings per hectare)'.
- 3.11 Policy 3.5 deals with the quality and design of housing and requires development to have regard to the space standards set out in table 3.3.
- 3.12 Policy 7.4 considers 'Local Character' and states that development should have regard to the form, function and structure of an area, and the scale, mass and orientation of a building.
- 3.13 Policy 7.6 requires architecture to make a positive and coherent contribution to the streetscape. Materials and details should complement the local architecture.

- 3.14 Policy 7.8 deals with 'Heritage Assets and Archaeology' and requires development to value, conserve and restore heritage assets. Development should be sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and detail.
- 3.15 Relevant local policies are in the Camden Local Plan (2017) (**appendix G**). Policy A1 deals with managing the impact of development The Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. Planning permission will be granted for development unless this causes unacceptable harm to amenity. It reads:
- 3.16 Policy D1 deals with design and requires it to be of high quality and requires the following:
- a. respects local context and character;*
  - b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with "Policy D2 Heritage";*
  - c. is sustainable in design and construction, incorporating best practice in resource management and climate change mitigation and adaptation;*
  - d. is of sustainable and durable construction and adaptable to different activities and land uses;*
  - e. comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character;*
  - f. integrates well with the surrounding streets and open spaces, improving movement through the site and wider area with direct, accessible and easily recognisable routes and contributes positively to the street frontage;*
  - g. is inclusive and accessible for all; h. promotes health;*
  - i. is secure and designed to minimise crime and antisocial behaviour;*
  - j. responds to natural features and preserves gardens and other open space;*

- k. incorporates high quality landscape design (including public art, where appropriate) and maximises opportunities for greening for example through planting of trees and other soft landscaping,*
- l. incorporates outdoor amenity space;*
- m. preserves strategic and local views;*
- n. for housing, provides a high standard of accommodation; and*
- o. carefully integrates building services equipment.*

*The Council will resist development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.*

3.17 Policy D2 deals with heritage matters and states

*The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens and locally listed heritage assets.*

*Designated heritage assets*

*Designed heritage assets include conservation areas and listed buildings. The Council will not permit the loss of or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, including conservation areas and Listed Buildings, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:*

- a. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;*
- b. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;*

- c. conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and*
- d. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.*

*The Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of a designated heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal convincingly outweigh that harm.*

#### *Conservation areas*

*Conservation areas are designated heritage assets and this section should be read in conjunction with the section above headed 'designated heritage assets'. In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management strategies when assessing applications within conservation areas.*

#### *The Council will:*

- e. require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area;*
- f. resist the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area;*
- g. resist development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character or appearance of that conservation area; and*
- h. preserve trees and garden spaces which contribute to the character and appearance of a conservation area or which provide a setting for Camden's architectural heritage.*

- 3.18 Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance 1 (CPG1) (**appendix H**) considers design and at section 3 provides the Council's position on heritage. It states that

development will only be permitted within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

3.19 CPG6 (**appendix H**) deals with amenity and states that outlook from new developments should be designed to be pleasant. This is described as being the visual amenity enjoyed by occupants when looking out of their windows. Developments should be designed so that the occupiers have a pleasant outlook.

3.20 The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2000) (PHCAS) identifies St Marks Crescent as being a Secondary Road. It states:

*St. Mark's Crescent is an addition to the Southampton Estate layout and runs parallel to the Regent's Canal. Developed at the same time as the majority of properties within this sub area, the buildings are of a villa style. However, the street is more intimate and enclosed in character, with a narrow carriageway, small front garden areas and a high density of development. Although there are no street trees, the green character of the area is reinforced by views through the gaps between buildings on the west side of the crescent, which afford glimpses of the rear gardens that run down to the canal. There are also long views at the southern end of St. Mark's Crescent across the rear gardens of villa properties on Regent's Park Road.*

3.21 The PHCAS recognises the views into St. Mark's Crescent from Gloucester Avenue and from south of 27 Regent's Park Road as being of significance.

## 4 Planning Considerations

### 4.1 The reason for refusal reads:

*“The proposed replacement of window with door and erection of railings at first floor level, by virtue its siting, location and scale, would result in an unsympathetic addition to the host building, that would have an adverse effect of the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached buildings and cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area, contrary to Camden Local Plan policies D1 and D2”*

4.2 There are three parts to this: that the position and size of the door and ‘railings’ would be unsympathetic to the appeal building; that the alterations would adversely impact on the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached buildings; and that the result of this would be to cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

### **Siting, location and scale**

4.3 It is important to clarify that the proposed feature is a balustrade and not railings, as stated in the reason for refusal, because it has an architectural quality to it that would be complimentary to the building’s façade. Unlike a railing the balustrade would be formed from a row of repeating decorative balusters. This is more in keeping with the style of the appeal building and neighbouring properties. It is intended to use an architecturally decorative to match others in the locality and this could be controlled by way of a planning conditions.





**Ornamental balustrade on neighbouring building.**

- 4.4 The proposed fanlight and the single door maintain the original appearance of the building. The proposal retains the original '6 over 6' panes. The height of the balcony disguises the bottom of the door. Therefore the appearance of the opening when viewed from the canal would be of a 4 pane high window/opening that would mirror the existing window arrangement and remain sympathetic to the host building.

#### **Symmetry of the pair of semi-detached buildings**

- 4.5 The reason for refusal states that the proposal would have an adverse effect of the symmetry of the pair of semi-detached buildings. No objection was raised by the

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee in relation to this planning application.

- 4.6 The appeal proposals relate to matters of detail, relocation of a balustrade and a new opening of traditional design. These are features that are common within many properties along this part of the Conservation Area. The proposals do not relate to alterations to the general proportions of the buildings. Their bulk and massing remain unchanged and therefore the symmetry of the pair would be largely unaffected by these proposals.
- 4.7 There are a number of variations in the façade of the semi-detached buildings, some original and some as a consequence of alterations over time, that has diluted their symmetry:
- i. The window arrangements are different. No. 15 retains the original ‘6 over 6’ panes. No. 16 has at some point been replaced with ‘8 over 8’ panes (**appendix B Figure 7**);
  - ii. The second floor timber window in no. 16 has been altered by a much longer, almost double in length, replacement (**appendix B Figure 7**);
  - iii. The windows at ground and first floor level are different;
  - iv. No. 15 has a balcony including balustrade at first floor level. The application proposes the removal of this in exchange for the new opening and balustrade.
  - v. There is variation in site levels at lower ground and upper ground level with no. 15 being slightly higher.
  - vi. The ground floor balustrades to the rear are of different design and height;

vii. The fenestration at lower ground is different.

- 4.8 Consequently it is considered that limited weight should be given to the statement that the proposals would ‘seriously harm the surviving symmetry of the pair of houses’. The application proposals are a matter of detail and the bulk and mass of the pair is not being altered and the general proportions are unaffected. Therefore the remaining symmetry is retained.
- 4.9 In addition, the proposals seek to retain the original 6 over 6 window pane arrangement, reintroduce the traditional trace bars in the first floor fanlight and substitute the existing balustrade for a new one in a different location. High quality materials are proposed particularly the balustrade and can be controlled by a planning condition to ensure that it is fully sympathetic to the host building,
- 4.10 The fact that properties have been altered at the rear has been considered as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in the locality. A recent decision at 31 St Mark’s Crescent (ref: 2016/7071/P) was approved in February 2017 for alterations to the dwelling including rear extension with terrace; replacement windows; rooflights; and alterations to fenestration (**appendix J**).
- 4.11 At paragraph 3.5 of the Officer’s report regarding no 31, reference is made to an objection to the proposals on the basis that there is a ‘clear contrast between the dwelling and its garden setting’. However, the Officer considered that this was no longer a defining characteristic for properties in the row/local area, and consequently it would not lead to a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the local area (**appendix J**).
- 4.12 At paragraph 3.6 of the report it is recognised that rear extensions are a common feature and are not considered to disrupt a uniform row of dwellings or appear uncharacteristic to the area. Alterations to the rear are also a common feature in

the rear elevations of dwellings in the locality. Consequently the opening and balustrade would not cause harm to the conservation area and overall the proposals would preserve and enhance the original window arrangement, thus positively contributing to it.

- 4.13 The character of the area was also recognised by Officer's in an application for alteration and extension of the appeal building at lower ground floor level (**appendix F**). In 2010 the Council were minded to approve an application at the appeal property for the following:

*“Alterations and extensions including new basement extension with rear lightwell, erection of rear extension at lower ground floor level, and extension into front lightwell to existing garden flat (Class C3).”*

- 4.14 In consideration of the rear extension the Officer stated in their report:

*“The extension would lead to the loss of the lower ground floor bay, but such a loss was considered acceptable in an application for a full width lower ground floor extension to no. 10 St Mark's Crescent in 2009 (reference 2009/2070/P). The report for this application considered the extension to be subordinate, and noted that many properties along the terrace had undergone various alterations and extensions “which while not all sympathetic to the original character of the terrace, as a whole, add to the character of this rear elevation”.”*

*The rear of St Mark's Crescent is visible from the canal towpath, and as mentioned in the officers report for no. 10 St Mark's Crescent, many properties have full-width extensions. Historic extensions exist at nos. 4, 7, 9, 11, 12 & 16 St Mark's Crescent, with more recent permissions granted at nos. 2 (26/11/2009), 5 (23/11/2009), 8 (09/03/2007), and 10 (16/07/2009).*

*The rear of properties from no's 1 – 16 St Mark's Crescent no longer display an unaltered rear elevation, with rear extensions now forming part of the character of the rear of these properties."*

[OUR UNDERLINING]

- 4.15 This clearly recognises that, whilst not all extensions and alterations are sympathetic at the rear of St Mark's Crescent they do form part of the character of the area. Further the officer confirms that these are visible from the towpath and are common features when viewed from this part of the Conservation Area.
- 4.16 The fact that the Council were minded to approve significant alterations to the property appears to contradict the reason for refusal in the appeal scheme where it states that the replacement window and railing would adversely affect the symmetry of the pair of the semi-detached buildings.
- 4.17 The scheme proposed a basement and lightwell below the existing lower ground floor. The garden level extension would have been higher than the neighbouring rear extension by approximately 0.5m and with an additional 0.3m metal framed rooflight above that. The proportions of the two rear extensions would have been discordant. In addition the fenestration was different.
- 4.18 The proposed rooflight would have risen up in front of the ground floor bay windows obscuring the bottom part of them when viewed from the canal towpath.
- 4.19 It is considered that the Council's decision to recommend approval for these works is a recognition that the rear of properties in St Mark's Crescent are typified by alterations and extensions, and that it is accepted that the symmetry of most has been lost. This is what establishes the character of this part of the Conservation Area. In that instance the Council followed the correct approach and process in decision taking for this type of development.

4.20 In 2012 the Council approved an extension at ground floor (Ref: 2012/2515/P) which included a rear fenestration that did not marry with the neighbouring building (**appendix E**). Railings of little architectural merit that were of a different style and height to some installed at no. 16 were also approved.



**Relationship between lower and ground level between no's 15 & 16 as built**

4.21 It is considered that these introduced asymmetrical features to the rear of the property. Further it suggests a lack of continuity in decision taking.

### **Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area**

4.22 It is recognised that many properties have been altered at the rear facing onto the canal. It is this eclectic mix of architectural designs and features that make the character of the area.

4.23 Paragraph 126 of the NPPF states that when conserving heritage assets that it should be in "... a manner appropriate to their significance." At paragraph 132 it states:

*"When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given*

*to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be."*

4.24 Historic England provide guidance on assessing 'significance' in 'Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning: 3 – The Setting of Heritage Assets' (2015). This sets out the steps to understanding the significance of a heritage asset:

Step 1: identify which heritage assets and their settings are affected.

Step 2: assess whether, how and to what degree these settings make a contribution to the significance of the heritage asset(s).

Step 3: assess the effects of the proposed development, whether beneficial or harmful, on that significance.

Step 4: explore the way to maximise enhancement and avoid or minimise harm.

Step 5: make and document the decision and monitor outcomes.

4.25 The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (**appendix A**) is the starting point in terms of understanding the significance of the heritage assets within it. St Mark's Crescent is identified as being within Sub Area One – Regents Park South, and recognises that it runs parallel with the Regent's Canal. The appraisal predominantly focuses on the front of properties identifying them as villa style buildings and the street as being intimate and enclosed in character. Gaps between buildings are identified as being important offering views through to the canal. The rear of the properties are not referenced.

4.26 The significance of the Regent's Canal is identified as being designated Open Space, Site of Nature Conservation Importance and being part of a Green Chain. It

is recognised as being a significant feature of the Conservation Area and in the 'layout and planning of the estate'. It states that:

*"...a number of buildings are designed to appear attractive when viewed from the canal with applied decoration to rear elevations."*

- 4.27 Recognised 'Significant views' within Sub Area One are those along the Regent's Canal as being 'towards Primrose Hill School and St. Mark's Church'. Views along this part of the canal are not mentioned.
- 4.28 The rear of St. Mark's Crescent is not identified as being of significance within the Conservation Area and this stretch of the canal is not recognised as being a 'Significant view'. Consequently, following the guidance in the NPPF and Historic England 'Good Practice Advice: 3' it is considered that limited weight should be given to the significance of the rear of St. Mark's Crescent. The majority of rear elevations have been altered, with varying architectural features in both historic and contemporary styles. Notwithstanding, they are generally of a good quality and the variety is what establishes the character of the area and views from the tow path.
- 4.29 The fact that properties have been altered at the rear has been considered as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications in the locality. This was clear in the recent decision at 31 St Mark's Crescent (ref: 2016/7071/P) (**appendix J**) was approved in February 2017 for alterations to the dwelling including rear extension with terrace; replacement windows; rooflights; and alterations to fenestration.
- 4.30 As stated at paragraph 4.12 of this statement the Officer's report made reference to an objection on the basis that there is a 'clear contrast between the dwelling and its garden setting'. However, the Officer considered that this was no longer a defining characteristic for properties in the row/local area and consequently it



would not lead to a significant impact upon the character and appearance of the local area.

- 4.31 Further it was recognised that rear extensions are a common feature which do not disrupt or appear uncharacteristic for the area. The form of development proposed as part of this application feature in the rear elevations of other dwellings in the row of houses. Therefore the introduction of a door, which in effect is an elongated window, would not cause significant harm to the conservation area. The nature of the proposed works fit with the character of the area and would further enhance it.
- 4.32 The officer's report for the appeal scheme (**appendix H**) recognises at paragraph 2.3.4 that no's 9 and 10 St Mark's Crescent have been altered in a similar fashion to the appeal proposal. In determining that application the Officer stated that the balcony would match an existing balustrade in style and is not considered to harm the host building.
- 4.33 Policy document CPG1 provides design guidance (**appendix I**). Section 4 considers extensions, alterations and conservatories. The relevant 'Key Messages' state that alterations should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings, and that windows, doors and materials should complement the existing building.
- 4.34 There are examples of balconies and balustrades on properties within the architectural group of buildings that are identical to the appeal proposals.



**No 9 St Mark's Crescent**

4.35 It is considered that this demonstrates a lack of continuity in decision making, as well as the level of significance placed upon the heritage asset.

## 5. Summary & Conclusions

- 5.1 Most buildings within this stretch of the Conservation Area have been altered at the rear and it is this eclectic arrangement that forms the character of the area. The proposal meet the relevant policy for design (D1) as it would respect local context and character. Policy D2 is unequivocal in order to maintain their character the Council will take account of Conservation Area Statements when assessing planning applications. This part of the Regents Canal is not identified as being a key view within the Conservation Area Statement and reference is focussed on the front of the properties. As the NPPF recognises the more important the asset the greater the weight should be given. Therefore the harm that would be caused by the appeal proposals would not be significant.
- 5.2 The proposal seeks to enhance the living conditions within the first and second floor maisonette. At present there is a very impractical balcony that is potentially dangerous to access from the internal staircase. The appeal scheme would remove this balcony and balustrade and relocate the latter.
- 5.3 The architecture, detailing and materials match the existing building, and would reinstate original architectural features. There is already disruption in the appearance of the pair of semi's and within the cluster of dwellings. The case officer recognises that the pair of semi's are not strictly symmetrical.
- 5.4 There are considerable benefits associated with the proposed development which it is considered outweigh any perceived harm to the Conservation Area, in accordance with the NPPF.
- 5.5 Taking the above into account it is considered that this appeal should be allowed.

# Appendix A

# Appendix B

# Appendix C

# Appendix D

# Appendix E



# Appendix F

# Appendix G

# Appendix H

# Appendix I

# Appendix J