
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 June 2019

by Les Greenwood MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 June 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/19/3222996

104 Drummond Street, London NW1 2HN

- 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 Philip Mohr against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2018/4530/P, dated 20 September 2018, was refused by notice dated 8 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a 2 storey (3 floor) rear extension with a second floor terrace above, including the alteration of the rear elevation and the internal layout of both the existing flats in the building, bringing the rear parapet in line with the neighbouring property no. 106 and replacing and upgrading the roof with a higher insulation standard.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a 2 storey (3 floor) rear extension with a second floor terrace above, including the alteration of the rear elevation and the internal layout of both the existing flats in the building, bringing the rear parapet in line with the neighbouring property no. 106 and replacing and upgrading the roof with a higher insulation standard, in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2018/4530/P, dated 20 September 2018, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1808/P00, 1808/P01, 1808/P02, 1808/P03, 1808/P04 and 1808/P05.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Before the use of the second floor terrace commences, a privacy screen shall be installed in accordance with details submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved screen shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the building and the local area.

Reasons

3. 104 Drummond Street is a mid-terrace 3 storey building, plus a lower ground floor that makes it 4 storeys at the back. It is divided into a studio flat on the lower ground floor and a 3 bedroom flat on the upper floors. The proposal is to build a relatively shallow, 3 floor rear extension to improve both flats, with a roof terrace at second floor level plus other roof alterations.
4. The proposed extension would not be seen from Drummond Street, but would be visible from the residential development at the back, which includes an open courtyard space. These views are of the back of a terrace where many of the other buildings have been extended in a variety of ways, often to a similar height and some with roof terraces. The Council argues that the proposal should be looked at as part of a distinct terrace of just 4 buildings (Nos 102 to 108). The only physical separation is at ground floor level, however, so that these buildings actually form part of a much longer terrace within which tall rear extensions and high level roof terraces with railings are common.
5. Within this setting, No 104 and its immediate neighbour No 102 are almost an anomaly in that they have been little altered. The Council advises that the rear extension to the other adjoining building, No 106, is unauthorised and should not be taken into account. Even leaving this aside, however, the proposal would sit within a terrace of similarly extended buildings. The existing rear roof of No 104 is not of any particular architectural value and can reasonably be altered. The proposal has been designed to fit in well in its context. This includes the high level doorway and privacy screen, which would not be visually intrusive or notably out of character with the rest of the terrace.
6. I note that the Council's Supplementary Planning Document *Camden Planning Guidance: Design* (CPG1) strongly discourages extensions that are higher than 1 full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions. I agree with the Council that the proposal would not be 1 full storey below the eaves level and therefore conflicts with this specific guidance. On the other hand, the proposal would not be taller or bulkier than other nearby rear projections, even if I disregard the extension to No 106.
7. Despite a partial breach of the guidance in CPG1, I conclude that the proposal would complement rather than harm the character and appearance of the building and the local area. It therefore accords with the aims of Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and CPG1, to secure high quality design that respects local context and character.
8. I impose a condition specifying the relevant plans to provide certainty and another requiring the use of matching materials to protect local character and appearance. A further condition requiring installation of the proposed terrace screen is necessary to protect neighbour's privacy.
9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should succeed.

Les Greenwood

INSPECTOR