
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 1 October 2018

by M Allen BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/18/3201404
21 Canfield Place, London NW6 3BT

- 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 Terry Walker against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2017/6066/P, dated 30 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 16 February 2018.
 - The development proposed is the conversion of single family dwelling into 1no. studio & 1no. duplex unit.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the appeal was submitted the Government has published a new National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Comments were sought from the Council and the Appellant. I have had regard to any comments received. As both main parties have been provided with the opportunity to provide comments no injustice has been caused by the publication of the new Framework. I have considered the appeal on the basis of the revised Framework.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are (i) whether the development should be car-free and (ii) the effect on the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

Car-free development

4. Policy T2 of the Camden Local Plan requires that all new developments, other than a number of exceptions, be car-free. The aim of this is to reduce air pollution and congestion, as well as to improve the attractiveness of the area for local walking and cycling. There is no evidence before me to demonstrate that the scheme should not be car-free as required by this policy or that the scheme falls within one of the exceptions. Whilst I note that a draft planning obligation has been submitted by the Council, this is unsigned and would not therefore secure the development as car-free. In the absence of a secure

mechanism in this regard the proposal fails to ensure the development as car – free and therefore does not comply with the requirements of policy T2.

Character and appearance

5. The appeal site comprises a three storey building located within a terrace of properties. At street level is a doorway providing access to the existing residential accommodation together with a garage door. At first floor level is a small balcony with access from double doors, and a window. The street is characterised by a terrace of three storey properties along the north side and single storey garages to the south side. The facades of the buildings within the street are characterised by a variety of designs and detailing; some retain garage doors, albeit that they differ in design from those at the appeal site, and a number are modern in appearance, whilst others have been removed and some replaced with commercial shop fronts.
6. As such, whilst the existing garage doors are an attractive feature and to some degree reflect the history of the building, they are no longer reflective of the prevailing character of buildings within the street. As a consequence, they do not constitute an important element of the townscape within this part of the street. Moreover the presence of bressummer beams above openings is also no longer a common feature. Therefore the removal of these elements would add further to the diversity of building facades within the streetscene, particularly at this western end of the street, rather than detracting from it. As a consequence of the existing variety of façades, despite some concerns held by the Council about arched lintels, the proposal would not be an unsympathetic alteration or incongruous element within the street.
7. In coming to this view, I acknowledge the Council's view that the development at this western end of Canfield Place has a different character than the eastern end. However, in my view, the loss of the garage doors would not be harmful to the character of the street at this location, for the reasons above.
8. Accordingly I find that the scheme would not result in an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the building or surrounding area and would accord with policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan, which seeks to ensure a high standard of design in all development.

Conclusion

9. Whilst I have found no harm to the character and appearance of the building or area, this does not outweigh that the scheme would not be car-free as required by planning policy. As such it is concluded that the appeal should not succeed.

Martin Allen

INSPECTOR