



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 May 2019

by Rebecca McAndrew BA Hons, PG Dip Urban Design, MSc, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 November 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/19/3222144
66 Charlotte Street, London W1T 4QE

- 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 Roger Lass against the decision of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2018/3838/P, dated 7 August 2018, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is a new rear extension to replace existing small closet wing and outbuilding. New mansard with dormers to the rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the scheme on the character and appearance of the host building, the adjoining terrace and the Charlotte Street Conservation Area (CSCA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within the CSCA which is a mixed residential and commercial area. It is characterised by a grid pattern of streets flanked by four and five storey terraces, many of which date back to the mid to late 17th Century. The appeal site comprises a four storey plus basement building within a terrace.
4. The Charlotte Street Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2008) (CSCAAMP) and the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan (2014) seek to accommodate the future development needs of the area whilst protecting the intrinsic values of the CSCA. The CSCAAMP identifies the terrace as a non-designated heritage asset and recognises the significance of historic rear elevations. It also advises that it is important to preserve historic rooflines with the CSCA, including parapets.
5. Whilst the existing rear elevation of the terrace includes a variety of mansard roof designs, the consistent parapet line running from Nos 66 to 72 Charlotte Street remains intact. In my view, this unaltered parapet is intrinsic to the character and appearance of the rear elevation of this terrace and the CSCA. The proposed roof extension would add an additional floor to the property and

- would create a new mansard roof atop. This would significantly raise the height of the rear parapet of the property, unacceptably interrupting the existing continuous parapet design feature. This proposed extension would also increase the mass and bulk of the building in comparison to both the existing property and other buildings in the terrace. The proposed roof extension would therefore unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property, the area and the CSCA.
6. The adjacent property, No 64 Charlotte Street, has been recently extended and is higher than the proposals. I also note the appellant's assertion that 'the proposals would mask the scale of the flank wall to No 64 and offer a transition to the remainder of the terrace'. However, No 64 is a corner property, whose scale and mass at the rear reflects the context of the adjoining Tottenham Street terrace, rather than the appeal property and Charlotte Street. On this basis, it is the adjoining properties on Charlotte Street, rather than No 64, which are the appropriate context for the proposed scheme. As such, I offer limited weight to these considerations in support of the proposal.
 7. I recognise that the proposed mansard roof extension would sit at a similar height to the adjacent property No 68 and would meet the specific design guidance on mansard roofs within the Camden Planning Guidance 1: Design (2018) (CPG1). However, given the increased height of the parapet wall, as described, the proposed roof extension would unacceptably increase the mass and bulk of the building. I therefore attach limited weight to these considerations in support of allowing the appeal.
 8. Turning to the proposed four storey rear extension, whilst paragraph 4.13 of the CPG1 advises that extensions should be one storey lower than the existing parapet level, the proposed extension would sit at the same height as the existing parapet. I recognise that there is no consistent pattern of rear closet wing extensions in the immediate vicinity. However, the proposal would be significantly higher than other rear extensions along this part of the terrace. Consequently, the proposed extension would have an excessive height and mass which would dominate the existing rear elevation and would not respect the existing pattern of rear development. The proposed rear extension would therefore unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the host property, the area and the CSCA.
 9. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposals would not be widely visible within the public realm, the site is nonetheless part of the CSCA. As such I have found the scheme would harm the character and appearance of the property, the terrace and the area.
 10. For the reasons above, the development would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CSCA. The harm that would be caused to the significance of the CSCA therefore needs to be assessed against the public benefits that would result from the scheme. Due to the relatively small scale and lack of prominence of the proposal, the harm would be 'less than substantial' in the context of the context of paragraphs 133-134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019). The public benefits of the scheme would include upgrading the building, the provision of additional office space for small businesses, an improved internal layout and the replacement of poorly detailed rear windows and plastic drainage pipes with more appropriate detailed windows and rainwater goods, which would improve the rear elevation of the

building. However, these benefits would be deliverable by the permitted less harmful schemes. Therefore, the limited public benefits associated with these elements do not outweigh the harm in this case.

11. I conclude the scheme would be contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan (2017) and the provisions of the CPG1 and the Framework. Taken together, these seek to secure good quality design which takes into account the character and design of the existing property and surroundings, with special attention paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the CSCA.

Other matters

12. I have considered other examples of development in the vicinity cited by the appellant's agent. Based on the information before me, it appears that those schemes differ from the appeal proposal before me. That aside, each proposal must be considered on its own merit. As such, I have found the appeal proposal would result in significant harm as I have previously set out.

Conclusion

13. The proposal would conflict with the development plan, the Framework and Conservation Area legislation and guidance and there are no material considerations that would indicate that the appeal should be allowed. Therefore, for the reasons given, the appeal is dismissed.

Rebecca McAndrew

INSPECTOR