



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 September 2018

by Andrew Dawe BSc(Hons) MSc MPhil MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21st September 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/18/3197539

72 Cricklewood Broadway, London NW2 3EP

- 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 Adeel Bashir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2017/6926/P, dated 15 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 5 February 2018.
 - The development proposed is erection of a mansard roof extension and associated alterations to create 1 x 2 bedroom flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the locally listed host building and the wider building group.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The site is a mid-terrace property, the terrace as a whole maintaining a pleasant and distinctively consistent appearance at the front. This relates particularly to the architectural detailing of the upper floors, capped by a balustrade with pillars separating ornate railings. From street level, the balustrade largely screens the pitched roof behind and so, together with those associated features, is a key and prominent component of the terrace in terms of providing pleasingly consistent horizontal emphasis to its roofscape. Despite the existing three storey height of the building, Cricklewood Broadway is a straight and wide road allowing the balustrade level to be clearly visible and appreciated within the streetscene from street level.
4. The pitched roofs of the terrace are exposed to the rear. However, along the length of the terrace they have a generally consistent and unaltered design that provides a pleasing degree of continuity to that rear roofscape. Furthermore, that roofscape is clearly visible from near to the ends of Ebbsfleet Road and Skardu Road as well as in albeit private views from the rear gardens of properties fronting those roads.
5. The proposed extension would occupy the full width of the roof, removing the existing pitch and being noticeably higher than it. Furthermore, it would

extend significantly higher than the balustrade and with a steeply sloping front elevation immediately abutting the back of that existing feature. Those factors would combine to cause the proposal to be clearly visible from street level at the front, particularly from the opposite side of the road and on the approaches to the site. From the north, that would be less so for part of the year at least due to an intervening street tree which would provide screening with its leaves on. Nevertheless it is likely that such screening would be substantially diminished in the winter months with the leaves off. Additionally, not only would the proposal be seen above the height of the balustrade railings but also through them, where open sky is currently visible, thereby significantly lessening their visual prominence. For these reasons, the proposal would draw the eye disproportionately and stand out within the frontage streetscene as an obtrusive and jarring feature, harmfully breaking that current degree of continuity.

6. To the rear, the proposal's continuation of the main rear elevation upwards, and noticeably higher than the existing roof and those of the rest of the terrace would substantially disrupt the degree of continuity of that rear roofscape. As such, despite the intention to utilise matching brickwork, it would stand out as a dominant and jarring feature as seen from public vantage points in Ebbsfleet Road and Skardu Road as well as from the nearest rear gardens of properties fronting those roads.
7. The proposal would utilise UPVC for the window frames. Whilst not a traditional material, I note that it is used on the existing building and others in the terrace and so would be unlikely to be seen as alien in that context. However, this factor does not deflect from the harm that I have otherwise found would be caused by the proposal.
8. I have had regard to other examples of roof extensions either constructed or with extant planning permission on similarly designed properties in the locality, highlighted by the appellant. However, none of those cases relate to the terrace concerned. Furthermore, that at No 63a in the opposite terrace differs in that from the front it is fairly discrete in terms of its massing effect and positioning and at the rear cannot be so clearly seen from public vantage points in the context of the rear of the terrace as a whole, due to intervening buildings. That at No 99, and as granted planning permission at Nos 93 and 95, are of similar design at the front to that proposed albeit that it is unclear as to whether they are and would be set as close to the balustrade. Nevertheless, they relate to a terrace further along the road and on the opposite side, therefore not seen in the same immediate context. The same applies more so in respect of the rear roofscape relating to that terrace. Those other cases do not therefore provide a precedent for the appeal proposal which I have determined on its own merits.
9. I have had regard to any public benefits of the proposal in weighing these against its effect on the significance of the locally listed non-designated heritage asset comprising No 72 and the associated terrace. Whilst it would add to the local housing supply, that benefit would be small, relating only to a single dwelling. It would therefore be insufficient to outweigh the harm that I have otherwise found would be caused, and I have not received any substantive evidence relating to any other public benefits that would do so.

10. For the above reasons, the proposed development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the locally listed host building and the wider building group. As such, it would be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan which together require development to respect local context and character and to preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's heritage assets including those that are locally listed.

Other matter

11. The Council states in its decision notice that its second and third reasons for refusal could have been addressed via a legal agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. No such legal agreement has been submitted, however neither has the appellant contested the matters concerned in his submissions albeit that the Council states that he has challenged the requirement for a Construction Management Plan. Therefore, as I have found there to be unacceptable harm in relation to the main issue, it has not been necessary for me to consider these matters in any further detail.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having taken account of all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew Dawe

INSPECTOR