

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 May 2018

**by Caroline Jones BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 19<sup>th</sup> June 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/18/3194261**  
**92 Fleet Road, London NW3 2QX**

- 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 and Mrs Steinhouse against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2017/5028/P, dated 8 September 2017, was refused by notice dated 8 November 2017.
  - The development proposed is described on the application form as 'minor shop front alterations and internal rearrangements to the basement flat at 92 Fleet Road'.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for alterations to front elevation comprising residential door replacement and additional windows within existing shopfront stallriser at 92 Fleet Road, London NW3 2QX in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2017/5028/P, dated 8 September 2018, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Site location plan 001, Proposed Plans 110, Proposed front elevation 120 and Proposed front elevation detail 121.
  - 3) All new external work shall be carried out in materials that resemble, as closely as possible, in colour and texture those of the existing building, unless otherwise specified in the approved application.

## Preliminary Matter

2. For clarification, I have altered the description of development in the decision above to that given on the Council's decision notice as reflected on the appeal form.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area including the Mansfield Conservation Area.

## Reasons

4. 92 Fleet Road is a four storey terraced property within a small parade of shops. The property comprises residential use on the upper floors and at basement level with a retail unit at ground floor. The shopfronts within the parade display considerable diversity in terms of their form. The appeal shopfront contains a part timber/part glazed front door to the shop and a timber panelled door to the residential entrance. The shop has a glazed display and a stallriser clad in slate tiles within which an elongated glazed window has been inserted in one corner. The property is within the Mansfield Conservation Area (MCA) and as such I must have regard to Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 which places a duty upon me to give special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area.
5. The Council's 'Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy' (MS) divides the MCA into two sub areas of distinctively different character. The appeal site lies within sub area one, Fleet Road, which is identified as a busy one way road, urban in character containing a mix of commercial premises and retail units mixed with residential properties. Nos 92-88 Fleet Road are identified as 2 pairs of Victorian buildings either side of the junction with Cressy Road with purpose built shopfronts. Whilst the upper floors and their architectural detailing contribute positively to the character and appearance of the MCA, the appraisal notes that there are no shopfronts left in the MCA that are noteworthy for their historic or architectural interest. The appeal shopfront is no exception and offers a fairly neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the MCA.
6. The MS states that inappropriate replacement shopfronts should be replaced with traditional shopfronts which respect the scale, proportions, use of materials, architectural style of the building and its relationship with surrounding facades. Camden Planning Guidance 1: Design (CPG1) states that stallrisers should be retained and generally incorporated to any new shopfront on period buildings. It goes on to say that they should be faced in appropriate materials for the context.
7. Given the commercial character of this part of the MCA, shopfronts are an important element. However, the existing stallriser is not a feature that gives character to the building or shopfront. The single elongated window panel appears contrived and the hanging slates are not historic or locally distinctive. The neighbouring shopfronts also display vast differences in their appearance some of which include stallrisers in a variety of materials whilst others have fully glazed shopfronts. I note the two shops which adjoin the appeal premises both contain solid stallrisers. However, while that to the west has a more traditional appearance with a tiled stallriser, the shopfront to the east cannot be said to have any architectural or historic interest despite its brick stallriser.
8. Whilst not of solid construction, the proposed alterations would be carried out within the existing stallriser and would still read as such albeit in glass and timber. It would maintain the existing composition and proportions of the shopfront. The proposed materials would match that of the existing shop and would be appropriate to the location. Furthermore, the proposed arrangement of glazing would give a more balanced appearance than that which exists at present.

9. Whilst I saw at my site visit that the majority of residential properties contain timber doors, the residential doorway at the appeal site forms part of the commercial frontage. The door would match that of the shop with four glazed panels. Given the mix of designs and materials along the parade, the proposed changes would not materially harm the character and appearance of the appeal property.
10. Given its existing appearance and surrounding context, in this particular instance I find that the proposal would have a neutral effect on the MCA and so would preserve its character and appearance. As such it would satisfy the requirements of the special duty for new development to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas.
11. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not conflict with the objectives of Policies D1 or D3 of the Camden Local Plan 2017, which together seek, amongst other things, high quality design in new and altered shopfronts which respects local context and character and preserves or enhances the historic environment. I have not considered the proposal against Policy A1 which relates to amenity and is therefore not relevant to the substantive matter.

### **Conditions**

12. As well as the standard time limit I have imposed a condition that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans in order to provide certainty. That relating to materials is necessary to ensure a satisfactory appearance.

### **Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above and taking all matters into account I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Caroline Jones*

INSPECTOR