



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 February 2020

by C Cresswell BSc (Hons) MA MBA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 March 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/19/3238860

98 Queens Crescent, Greater London, NW5 4DY

- 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 Macatex Ltd (F/O Zanopoly Ltd) against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2019/0386/P dated 21 December 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2019.
 - The development proposed is construction of mansard roof extension to provide additional living space for second floor flat.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. For conciseness, I have taken the description of development in the heading above from the Appeal Form rather than the Application Form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. This part Queens Crescent has a relatively mixed appearance, with variety of architectural styles visible within the street scene. However, a particularly distinctive feature is the prevalence of traditionally proportioned, older style terraces. These are prominent along much of Queens Crescent as well as many of the surrounding side streets.
5. The appeal property is within an older style terrace which contributes to this distinctive pattern of development. Although the ground floor of the terrace is dominated by contemporary shop fronts, the upper stories show more consistency and retain many of their original features. This includes the valley style roof, with a front parapet wall facing Queens Crescent.
6. Even though it would be set back from the front of the appeal property, the front elevation of the proposed mansard extension would be visible above the parapet wall at street level in both Queens Crescent and Ashdown Crescent. This would be a noticeable change as the roofline of the terrace would no longer maintain a uniform appearance along this frontage.

7. The rear elevation of the proposed extension would be visible at street level from parts of Weddington Road as well as from the upper storey windows of nearby properties. It would clearly disrupt the V-shaped pattern of the valley roof, which is a characteristic feature of the appeal property and remains unbroken along the length of the terrace.
8. The overall effect would be to noticeably alter the appearance of the terrace, eroding its original design features and proportions. This would incrementally harm the character and appearance of the street scene in this location.
9. I noted on the site visit that there are examples of mansard extensions on some other terraces within Queens Crescent. However, it is not clear when these extensions were granted planning permission or what policies were in force at that time. I have based my decision on current planning policies, including the Camden Planning Guidance¹. This indicates that a roof alteration is unlikely to be acceptable if there is an unbroken run of valley roofs and this has an adverse effect on the street scene. Although the appeal property is not situated in a Conservation Area, the proposal would nonetheless be in conflict with Policy D1 of the Local Plan² which seeks appropriate standards of design in all locations within the borough.
10. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. The appeal is therefore dismissed.

C Cresswell

INSPECTOR

¹ Camden Planning Guidance: Altering and Extending Your Home, March 2019.

² Camden Local Plan, 2017.