



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 January 2019

by **J Wilde C Eng MICE**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 January 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/18/3217134 33 Inverness Street, London NW1 7HB

- 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 Alexandre and Marie-Amelie Gorodetska against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2018/3043/P, dated 27 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 7 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is a new mansard roof providing a fourth bedroom with dormer window at the front and at the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the conservation area and on the setting of nearby listed buildings.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a four storey (plus basement) dwelling located on the south-west side of Inverness Street within the Camden Town Conservation Area. The property has a shallow pitched roof but this is set back and consequently is hardly noticeable from ground level. Viewed from the front the property effectively demonstrates two sections, with the dominant protruding section containing the front door with windows either side, and a relatively narrow vertical section with three well-proportioned windows in-line vertically. To the side of these windows is a setback lower subservient section with two vertical windows. Overall the property exhibits pleasing proportions.
4. The building is attached to the north-east to a relatively new three story flat roofed building, which serves as a school, the roof of which is about the same height as the parapet of the appeal building. Beyond this are several terraced properties of five storeys, the highest of which is contained within a mansard roof.
5. To the south-west of the appeal building there is a modern gateway at ground floor level that gives access to a development to the rear. This arrangement means that there is effectively a gap between the appeal building and the terrace containing the Grade II listed buildings numbered 37- 43 Inverness

- Street, further to the south-west. These properties are three storey and consequently somewhat lower than the appeal building.
6. The Council consider that the appeal property makes a positive contribution to the CA and I would agree with that assessment, taking into account the height, design and proportions of the property.
 7. The proposed development would see the addition of an extra storey housed within a mansard roof, which would extend 2.5m above the existing parapet. To accommodate the new roof the flank walls and chimneys would be extended.
 8. Whilst the mansard roof would be set back and angled it would nonetheless be very visible from ground level, unlike the existing pitched roof. I acknowledge that mansard roofs are a relatively common feature within the area. However, to my mind the proposed mansard would negatively impact upon the proportions of the property, which as I have previously stated is relatively narrow and tall. The proposed mansard would also disrupt the flow of roof heights that extend from the school to the listed buildings. It would also make the appeal property more dominant within the street scene, thereby detracting from the appearance of the listed buildings, and harming the integrity of the CA.
 9. I acknowledge that the height of the proposed mansard would be similar to that of the plant room of the attached school. However, the plant room is set back a considerable distance and is therefore barely visible from ground level. I also note that planning permission has been granted at the appeal property for a roof garden with glass balustrade. From the limited information available to me however, this would not be as intrusive as the proposed mansard addition.
 10. My attention has been drawn to several other permitted mansard roof extensions in the area. Whilst every case has to be decided on its own merits I do note that No 76 Delaney Street is in the middle of a homogenous terrace, unlike the appeal property, and No 85 Jamestown stands on a corner plot. I cannot therefore consider these to be setting a compelling precedent for allowing the present appeal.
 11. The Proposed development would not therefore preserve or enhance either the character or appearance of the conservation area as required by Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Nor would it preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the setting of the adjacent listed buildings as required by Section 72 (1) of the same Act. It is incumbent upon me to give considerable importance and weight to this identified harm.
 12. The harm to the significance of the CA and the setting of the listed buildings would be less than substantial and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) makes clear in paragraph 196 that any such harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the development. In this case however there would be no such benefits.
 13. By virtue of the harm identified conflict would exist with both policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017. The former of these requires that development respects local context and character while the latter makes clear

that development will be resisted that causes harm to the significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting and that does not preserve or enhance a CA.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, and having taken into account all other matters raised, including the more efficient use of the appeal building that would result from the proposed development, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

John Wilde

INSPECTOR