



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2019

by J Moss BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 September 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/19/3230050 Flat 3, 44 Falkland Road, London NW5 2XA

- 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 Mrs Eva Santner-Crook against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2017/6999/P, dated 20 December 2017, was refused by notice dated 28 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension with roof terrace at fourth floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. A lengthy and detailed description of the development has been provided on the planning application forms. During the course of the planning application, the proposal was amended. The Council's decision notice provides a succinct description of the amended scheme which reflects the plans that are before me. I have, therefore, relied on the Council's description of the development in this case.
3. The appellant has submitted a revised scheme with the appeal, which alters a principle element of the development proposed. This revision is, therefore, materially different to the scheme that formed the basis for the Council's decision. Whilst I note the Council has commented on this revision in their appeal statement, not all parties have been properly consulted on the changed development. Accordingly, I have not considered the revised scheme as to do so would prejudice the interests of all parties involved.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the building; and whether or not the development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area and the heritage assets that the appeal site is within or nearby, including the Kentish Town Conservation Area (KTCA) and Our Lady Help of Christians Church.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is within the KTCA and close to the grade II listed Our Lady Help of Christians Church located at the junction of Falkland Road with Lady

Margaret Road. The appeal site is located at the end of a traditional row of four storey terraced properties; this terrace is characteristic of this part of the conservation area.

6. There is evidence of roof alterations within the terrace, which have been drawn to my attention. These alterations are more obvious when viewed from the parking area and thoroughfare on Willingham Terrace, which is to the rear of the appeal site. Other than these alterations, the roofs of the terrace are largely unaltered. Indeed, the front of the terrace is, on the whole, finished at roof level with a prominent and continual parapet above the fourth floor windows, whilst in the rear elevation the distinctive 'V' shaped roof valleys are prevalent, creating a rhythm to the rear roof line.
7. This block of terraced properties with their relatively uniform appearance make a positive contribution to the significance of the KTCA.
8. In addition, the appeal site and the terrace are, from certain vantage points, viewed within the context of the grade II listed church. Along with the adjoining church hall, these buildings are within the setting of the listed building. Whilst the appeal site and the church are separated by the church hall, the appeal property is still prominent within the listed building's setting due to its comparative height.
9. The proposed development would replace the existing roof valley arrangement with a mansard roof extension, incorporating an enclosed roof terrace at the rear.
10. Whilst the mansard roof would be contained within the existing parapet walls on the front and side elevations of the property, its ridge height would exceed the height of the front and side façade of the building. Although this addition would effectively be at fourth floor level, its upper section would be visible from Falklands Road, particularly from viewpoints close to the junction with Lady Margaret Road. From these vantage points the development would protrude into the sky line above the appeal site and would adversely alter the front and side profile of the building in a manner that would be at odds with the vast majority of the remainder of the terrace.
11. In addition, the development would introduce a parapet wall to the rear elevation to form an enclosure to the roof terrace. The resultant loss of the distinctive 'V' shaped roof profile on the rear elevation would adversely affect the character of the property and disrupt the rhythm of the roof line of the terrace. Furthermore, the top section of the mansard roof would be visible above the new parapet wall and would protrude into the skyline above the appeal property. This protrusion would be apparent when viewed from Willingham Terrace and at the junction of Willingham Terrace with Leighton Road, which runs parallel to Falkland Road. Notwithstanding the development at 48 Falkland Road, the roof extension would be an incongruous feature within the terrace.
12. The Camden Planning Guidance on Design has been brought to my attention, which advises of the circumstances where roof extensions are likely to be considered acceptable. The development may well accord with some of the criteria stated; the proposed choice of materials being an example of this. However, the scheme as a whole would not comply with the vast majority of

- the criteria and would be in conflict with the general principles of the guidance for the reasons set out above.
13. I acknowledge that the development proposed was amended during the determination of the application in an attempt to address its effect on the street scene and the historic environment. These alterations do not, however, alter my conclusions with regard to the harm that would be caused by the scheme that is before me.
 14. My attention has also been drawn to the more modern blocks of flats on Willingham Terrace, and to other examples of roof extensions both in the appeal site terrace and on other properties in the area. The highlighted examples do not, however, reduce the harm identified in terms of the effect of the proposed development on the host property; the terrace within which the appeal property sits; and the setting of the nearby listed church.
 15. Having regard to my findings above, the development would have a harmful effect on both the character and appearance of the host property. It would be an unsympathetic addition within the street scene that would further erode the relatively uniform appearance of the terrace. Accordingly, the development would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the KTCA and the setting of the listed church. The development would, therefore, conflict with policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan Adopted June 2017, which require development to respect local context and character, whilst preserving or enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings.
 16. I find the harm caused to the heritage assets would be less than substantial. In these circumstances, paragraph 196 of the Framework makes it clear that where less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset would occur then this has to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.
 17. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would improve the standard of residential accommodation offered by the appeal dwelling for current and future occupiers. Whilst this may well be the case, it is not reasonable to conclude that this would amount to a public benefit and I give this matter limited weight.
 18. The Framework makes clear in paragraph 193 that great weight should be given to the conservation of a heritage asset. Accordingly, I find that the harm that would occur to the KTCA and the setting of the grade II listed Our Lady Help of Christians Church outweighs the limited benefit outlined above.

Conclusions

19. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

J Moss

INSPECTOR