



46 INVERNESS STREET,  
LONDON, NW1 7HB

Planning Appeal Statement

C Hancock

Final Version  
May 2021

## CONTENTS

---

1. Introduction .....	1
Appellants .....	2
Site and Surroundings .....	2
2. Relevant Planning History and Pre-application Discussions .....	4
3. Development Proposals .....	6
4. Grounds of Appeal .....	7
Introduction .....	7
Grounds of Appeal .....	7
Cited Planning Policy .....	16
5. Conclusion.....	17
Planning Balance .....	17
Conclusion.....	17

## 1. INTRODUCTION

---

This Planning Appeal Statement has been prepared by Triptych PD Limited in response to the London Borough of Camden's ('LBC'/'the Council') refusal of planning permission for *the demolition of the existing derelict building last used as a restaurant (Use Class A3) and the replacement with a two-storey plus basement residential* (as per the application form) but as altered by LBC to *the erection of two storey basement 2-bedroom dwelling house (Class C3) following demolition of existing single storey building (Class A1)* on 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2020 at 46 Inverness Street, London, NW1 7HB. The reasons for refusal were:

1. *The proposed development, by reason of its siting, height, massing and design, would represent a bulky, intrusive and incongruous addition to the streetscene that would conceal the historic pattern of development, harm the setting of the two adjacent Grade II listed buildings and harm the character and appearance of both Primrose Hill and Camden Town Conservation Areas, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*
2. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing an Approval in Principle, would fail to mitigate the impact of the basement works on the adjacent public highway, contrary to policies A1 (Managing the impact of development), T3 (Transport Infrastructure) and DM1 (Delivery and monitoring) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*
3. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area and fail to promote more sustainable and efficient forms of transport and active lifestyles, contrary to policies T2 (Parking and car-free development) and DM1 (Delivery and monitoring) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*
4. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing necessary highway works, would fail to secure adequate provision for and safety of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, contrary to policies A1 (Managing the impact of development), T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) and DM1 (Delivery and monitoring) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*
5. *The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a Construction Management Plan (CMP) and associated contributions to support the implementation of the CMP, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users and be detrimental to the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies A1 (Managing the impact of development), T4 (Sustainable movement of goods and materials) and DM1 (Delivery and monitoring) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*

The drawings and documents cited on the decision notice (and provided as part of the appeal submission) are as follows:

*Drawing Nos: Existing: 236534-001; 002; 100 A; 110; 111; 112. Proposed: 236534-201 A; 202 A; 203 A; 204 A; 210 A; 211; 220 A; 221 A; 222 A; 223 A Design and Access statement (August 2019); Daylight and sunlight assessment (prepared by Waldrams, dated 26th March 2019); Planning statement (dated October 2019); Heritage impact assessment (dated July 2019); Basement Impact Assessment (ref 19029.R01.P2) dated 23 November 2019 by Structure Workshop; Interpretative Geotechnical (ref.:J13674) by Southern Testing, dated March 2020; Flood Risk Statement (ref.:14159/AJP/SA/05.03.02.02) by Tully De' Ath Consultants, dated April 2020; Proposed Sheet Piling Summary drawing (ref.: SK10) by Stand Consulting Engineers, dated June 2020; Interpretative Geotechnical (ref.:J13674) by Southern Testing, dated March 2020; Flood Risk Statement (ref.:14159/AJP/SA/05.03.02.02) by Tully De' Ath Consultants, dated April 2020; Basement Impact Assessment Response to Campbell Reith 2nd Round of Comments by Stand Consulting Engineers (ref.:619), dated 12 June 2020; Basement Impact Assessment Response to Campbell Reith Underpinning Installation Movements and CIRIA C760 by Stand Consulting Engineers (ref.:619), dated 17 September 2020; Ground Movement Assessment Report (ref.: J13674-GMA-3), dated 17 September 2020, by Southern Testing.*

An error is noted in that Structure Workshop has never been involved in this project and as such did not provide the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA). The BIA was prepared by Stand Consulting Engineers dated November 2018 with reference 619. This is confirmed within the Council's own online records. It is considered an administrative error in the drafting of the decision notice and no doubt this will be confirmed by the Council within its submissions.

#### APPELLANTS

This submission is made on behalf of Christine Hancock who currently lives

and thereby release that onto the housing market. In addition, great attention has been taken in order to utilise air source heat pumps to provide power to the proposed home. As existing and future residents of the area, a significant amount of time and energy has been spent arriving at a wholly appropriate design that included a professional team including specialist heritage architects, an independent review of the design by a separate heritage consultant (KM Heritage) and positive engagement with the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

#### SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

46 Inverness Street is a single storey brick white rendered building the north side at the western end abutting 46 Inverness Street to the east and 24 Gloucester Crescent to the west. Both of these adjoining properties are Grade II listed but number 46 is not listed. The building is within the Primrose Hill and on the boundary of the Camden Town Conservation Areas.

The adjoining buildings are three and four storeys with Gloucester Crescent characterised by the four storeys and significantly tall trees within the front areas to the pavements providing a vertical

townscape. These buildings are generally rendered white on the ground floor and brick on the uppers with white detailing on the facades e.g. window frames and parapet lines.

On this western stretch of Inverness Street there is a variation in the design with less uniformity than the adjacent Crescent. Generally, the lowest number of storeys is three rising to five in both the traditional and modern corner buildings with Arlington Road.

The mix of traditional and modern buildings also provides a variation in the established brick palette with the later additions being paler in more of a buff colour.

The more eastern stretch of Inverness Street beyond Arlington Road is pedestrianized and commercial in nature in terms of both the building uses and the daily clothes and souvenir market stalls. The southeastern side is dominated by the significantly tall and bulky Mecca Bingo building and the commercial property that wraps round onto Camden High Street. The northwestern side is comprised of a three-storey terrace accommodating active commercial frontages at ground floor.

The surrounding context is critical to understand with respect to 46 Inverness Street. The building is dilapidated on the inside – comprised of one main space with adjacent storage and toilets having last been used as a restaurant – and shows significant decline on the exterior. Arguably these elements could be remedied but rather the fundamental point is that the current building does not positively benefit the character or appearance of either Conservation Area. Indeed, it can be said to detract from both. It is within a main building gap due to the junction of the two roads and is rightly subservient to the surroundings, in particular the adjacent listed buildings. However, overall it has a detrimental effect on the quality of the streetscene and Conservation Areas.

The property is very well served by public transport with an accessibility level of 6a with only 6b being higher.

## 2. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY AND PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

---

The planning history has been gained from the Council's online records and Officer's Report and is as follows:

- Erection of a new three-bedroom, two storey plus basement level dwelling following demolition of the existing building – application withdrawn (Council reference: 2015/0493);
- The excavation of a basement to provide additional restaurant facilities and external alterations to the front elevation and the roof – refused (Council reference: 9400189) due to likely disturbance to residents of the ventilation system and a detrimental impact on the residential character and amenity of the area due to increased noise and disturbance;
- Erection of a high-level extract duct up the flank wall up 24 Gloucester Crescent – refused (Council reference: 9300118);
- Alterations to ground floor front elevation and erection of extension at ground and first floors to existing single storey restaurant – refused (Council reference 9200346) due to a loss of sunlight and increased sense of enclosure to neighbouring garden; the proposed extension would adversely affect the character and appearance of this part of the Primrose Conservation Area but virtue of its bulk and detailed design; and there would likely be a detrimental impact by noise and disturbance from the extended restaurant on the residential amenity. This application was dismissed at appeal; and
- Extension to provide toilets and alterations to the frontage – conditional approval (Council reference: CTP/J11/2/9/10244).

Following the withdrawal of the application 2015/0493/P, which was for a development of a similar nature to the one currently proposed, a pre-application submission was made to the Council for a revised scheme (Council reference: 2016/1657/PRE). The response to this was assessed by Purcell and design alterations made, which form this further revised scheme.

As summary of the Officer's comments contained within that pre-application response are as follows:

- No objection is made in principle of a replacement structure in this location;
- The proposed infill of the gap to the extent proposed would detrimentally impact the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area and also the setting of the listed buildings in the immediate vicinity;
- The proposed height, scale, bulk and massing would impose, dominate and detract from both the Gloucester Crescent and Inverness Street listed buildings;
- The proposed infill house would not be subordinate or recessive and would be clearly visible in the significant view westward from Inverness Street to Gloucester Crescent;

- The proposed dwelling would be higher than the listed porch entrance structure at No 24 physically obscuring part of the flank wall of No. 24 Gloucester Crescent when approaching along Inverness Street;
- The concern regarding the impact of the first-floor extension on the listed buildings and conservation area were highlighted as a reason for refusal in the 1993 appeal decision;
- The proposed solid to void ratio and proportions do not follow the historic proportions, as can be seen by comparing the front doors, fan lights, window widths and solid masonry elements;
- The datums taken from the historic architecture of Inverness Street attempt to create a relationship but the result is the proposed development is seen as all the more overwhelming;
- The principle of developing the site is not objected to but the proposed new dwelling would result in harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area diminishing its value and heritage;
- The proposed excavation of a basement level would be acceptable provided it complied with current criteria and legislation.

The following text provides a summary of how these comments were addressed in these current proposals:

- The proposed height of the dwelling has been reduced by 1100mm to address general concerns regarding the overall height, scale and bulk of the proposals;
- Furthermore, the reduction in height directly responds to concerns regarding the listed porch entrance structure to 24 Gloucester Crescent, ensuring the level of the new dwelling is not overbearing or dominant;
- A larger gap and step have been introduced at the junction between the listed porch structure to No.24 Gloucester Crescent and the proposed dwelling, further separating the existing and new structures;
- The main elevation of the proposed dwelling has been set back further from the main elevation of 44 Inverness Street to improve the hierarchy of the new and listed facades;
- The fenestration has been simplified and reduced in size to ensure the appearance is subordinate to that of 44 Inverness Street and the wider streetscape. The arrangement has also been altered to provide a more traditional appearance;
- The materiality of the proposed dwelling has been altered to reduce the contrast between the new dwelling and the surrounding listed buildings. This serves to reduce the dominance of the dwelling in the context of the streetscape and surrounding listed buildings;
- The datums of the proposed dwelling have been altered to improve the relationship to the wider streetscape of Inverness Street and have been carefully considered to ensure the overall appearance is subordinate to that of the historic terrace.

### 3. DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

---

Section 2 ended with a summarised response to the Council's pre-application advice. The changes were made and the application submitted. For completeness, the description of development as shown on the decision notice is:

*Erection of two-storey plus basement 2-bedroom dwelling house (Class C3) following demolition of existing single storey building (Class A1).*

The application submission clearly identifies the proposals and in keeping with appeal guidance there is little merit in replicating in one Statement that which is clearly set out in another. Therefore, the Inspector is respectfully referred to the supporting documents that form this appeal submission, which includes those submitted at the time of application but not cited within the Council's decision notice – it is particularly noted that the Council makes no reference to the assessment by KM Heritage of the proposals and supports these, in fact finding those prior to the final changes also acceptable in heritage and built form terms.

## 4. GROUNDS OF APPEAL

### INTRODUCTION

Prior to the submission of this appeal, the Planning Officer confirmed (Kristina Smith) and as confirmed as Informative 2 on the decision notice, that the reasons for refusal number 2-5 could be overcome by entering into a Section 106 Legal Agreement. The confirmed mechanism by the Planning Officer is that the appeal be lodged and upon this, the Council's Legal Department will – under instruction – commence the drafting and dedicating resource to the legal process. It is therefore an agreed and matter of commonality that reasons 2-5 will be properly addressed by the s106 Agreement and this Statement will focus upon reason for refusal number 1, which states:

1. *The proposed development, by reason of its siting, height, massing and design, would represent a bulky, intrusive and incongruous addition to the streetscene that would conceal the historic pattern of development, harm the setting of the two adjacent Grade II listed buildings and harm the character and appearance of both Primrose Hill and Camden Town Conservation Areas, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.*

As is often the case, the Officer's Report provides the assessment upon which the conclusions and therefore decision is made. Table 1 identifies what is considered to be key text from that Report and the response.

### GROUNDS OF APPEAL

The following table (Table 1) identifies statements that require a response to and/or to acknowledge in terms of the evaluation of the proposals.

Table 1

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
3.7	<i>The existing single storey structure was historically built as a building ancillary to no.24 Gloucester Crescent and is clearly subordinate to both adjacent terrace houses. It is located at the confluence of Gloucester Crescent and Inverness Streets (as well as both Primrose Hill Conservation Area and Camden Town Conservation Area) and is an important signifier of how the two streets, of</i>	This is strongly refuted. Although 46 was built as an ancillary structure, rather it is an independent one. The view that it was purposefully designed to be subservient to the historic buildings on both sides is more the happenstance of function than the purposeful design of deference. As such it cannot be said, in our view, to meaningfully signify the difference

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
	<i>differing characters, status and periods, developed historically.</i>	between the two streets. This is reflected in the powerful architectural styles, scales and detailing of the houses in each terrace, not by the single storey, much altered, building between. In its current form, having been used for a number of different functions, it is in fact very difficult to relate it to either building or via its aesthetic appearance, read its true provenance as part of the historic townscape.
3.8	<i>The existing structure is somewhat dilapidated and run-down and there is no 'in principle' objection to a replacement structure provided it does not introduce an additional storey. This low, single storey building reflects the traditional pattern or character that could be expected from a return structure found at the junction of a Victorian development. As such, the gap or break between streets that it provides contributes to the particular architectural character of this part of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area as well as the adjacent Camden Town Conservation Area from which it is clearly visible.</i>	The justification for the added storey rests primarily on its impact on the listed buildings and conservation area in which it stands. For the former, the raised height does not, we believe, cause harm to the legibility of the historic development of the streets and it remains, therefore, readable as a 'return structure'. The gap will remain fully appreciable from the key vantage points on Gloucester Terrace, which rises to the south, and as detailed in the views analysis, all other views are rather oblique. We agree that the gap contributes, but in the balance, have weighed the public benefit of the improvements to 46 against the loss of a small part of the gap view from one vantage point.
3.9	<i>Similar gaps can be seen on other streets nearby and further afield as they are typical of Victorian development. Several examples are provided in the applicant's submission. In some cases these may have been subject to a degree of infilling, through the addition of some height – but</i>	Whether the gap was an intentional designed-in element of the suburban development or not, the key views of that gap and the greenery beyond will remain intact. The purpose of the wider contextual assessment was to indicate the many changes that had

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
	<i>in every case this is clearly a subordinate extension to the host building that retains a gap rather than a new dwelling house boldly inserted into the streetscene. The applicant's justification for losing the gap is that such gaps are unintentional and accidental, occurring where two roads intersect. However, the Council would argue that these areas are completely intentional and a result of planned development. It is the spaces around the Victorian houses, the spaces between the buildings, which add positively to the historic character and form part of the considered layout of these attractive Victorian developments. Once these planned spaces have been infilled, there is a loss of openness, a loss of views of rear elevations and a loss of appreciation of trees, greenery and distant sky which form an important backdrop.</i>	taken place in gap sites adjacent and to demonstrate, at least in part that they had not severely impacted on the legibility of the wider area.
3.10	<i>The justification goes on to say that the gap reveals the haphazard and evolutionary nature of the visible rear elevations which do not make a positive contribution to the conservation area. Again, the Council would disagree with this claim and maintain that the visible rear elevations – which in the case of the application site allows views of an apparently intact rear elevation of a listed building – provides a positive contribution to the streetscene and conservation area.</i>	It is refuted that the rear elevations of Gloucester Terrace are in some way a set-piece of architectural merit that have not been altered. We concur that visible rear elevations can make a positive contribution and that from vantage points assessed in the views section, these will remain visible with an extra storey to the proposal. Again, on balance with the heritage benefits delivered to the Conservation Area by the development, we view this as justifiable development, which enhances the significance of both conservation areas and improves, fundamentally, the gable ends of each terrace.

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
3.11	<i>The applicant's submission emphasises the dilapidated nature of the building and ascribes this to low significance. This may be true of the building per se, but it is not the actual bricks and mortar of the structure that officers seek to preserve - its importance and suitability for the site is a result of its scale and subsequent delineation between streets. It provides a clear indication of where Gloucester Crescent in Primrose Hill Conservation Area ends and Inverness Street in Camden Town Conservation Area begins. Shoehorning in a building that belongs to neither street not only results in a jarring and uncomfortable form in the streetscene, but serves to erode the distinction of the two streets and conceal the historical pattern of development.</i>	We would reiterate that the important properties of the current building will be maintained in the scheme and that the gap site will be legible. The proposed development has not been 'shoehorned' it has been carefully designed in, following extensive assessment and consideration of the listed buildings and surrounding streetscape. The proposal represents a thorough study of how the currently detrimental structure can be sensitively re-purposed as a liveable domestic building that makes a contribution to the area in which it stands. The array of forces acting on the site have been given due consideration against national, regional and local guidance and the harm/benefit equation carefully weighed. We believe the distinction between the two streets will remain intact by virtue of the new building, which mediates between them, but which is also unashamedly new in style.
3.12 & 3.13	<i>The gap also provides a break in the built urban form where it is possible to see trees located in the back gardens of properties on Gloucester Crescent. Of Inverness Street, the Primrose Hill CAS reads, 'This is a wide road that forms a transition from the lively urban character of Camden Town to the more sedate leafy character of the Conservation Area'.  Therefore, the principle of additional height in this location is strongly resisted</i>	Dealing with both of these paragraphs together and as previously stated, in the key views, the gap will remain legible with the added benefit of lessening the amount of visible gable end.

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
	<i>owing to the erosion of the gap, an important signifier of the transition between different streets and historic pattern of development; and the concealment of the adjacent listed rear elevation and loss of leafy views, features intrinsic to the character of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.</i>	
3.14	<i>The form of the proposed dwelling comprises a middle projecting section (to match the existing building line) and two 'wing-like' sections which are set back closer to the building lines of adjacent buildings and allow for the incorporation of two front lightwells. Due to the extremely constrained plot, there is no scope for the building to be pushed back to align with the building line established by the Inverness Street terrace which means that most of the front façade is hard up against the pavement.</i>	These fluctuations in the plane of the façade were explored and evolved in response to Council's commentary on the scheme, the lightwells in particular. The scale of the adjacent buildings was a substantial factor in the working up of the current design. Of paramount concern was the issue of the building line and how the new building addresses Inverness Street. The composition of the facade of the new building has been orchestrated to reference and respond to, the historic buildings on either side of it. This modulation is a sensitive and responsive design solution to the problem and is put forward as a conservation-led response to the challenge of softening the relationship between building and street.
3.15	<i>Although the existing building projects forward of the two adjacent buildings, its single storey scale allows for a more comfortable relationship with the street; however, increasing the height to two storeys results in a very intrusive and dominant building that has no regard to the pattern of development in the surrounding area. The projecting building line, when combined with the additional</i>	We would disagree with the view that height, per se, has primacy in regard of intrusion or dominance. Massing, comparative scale and volume are at least equal considerations and these have not properly been assessed by the Council. The articulated design by senior conservation architects at Purcell has mitigated the volumetric relationship between the proposed

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
	<i>height, also serves to obscure the view west from Inverness Street towards Inverness Street identified in the Primrose Hill CAS as significant.</i>	development and its neighbours and they remain dominant in a number of important, and in some cases subtle, ways. In essence, Purcell's design is a contextual modern building, which takes lines, design cues, ratios and materialities from the important buildings around it.  The final point is not clear, but we would presume the council means the buildings of Gloucester Terrace from Inverness Street. If that is so, it is not agreed and therefore conclude that the important views of the villas on the western side of the road remain intact.
3.16	<i>The depth of the building is limited to that of the existing structure - there is no curtilage beyond. The result is a very shallow building that appears shoehorned into its site with no breathing space on either side. This has the effect of overcrowding and overwhelming both neighbouring buildings. This would be unacceptable if the adjacent buildings were to be non-designated heritage assets; however, given their listed status, the impact is even more severe.</i>	Although the buildings on either side are listed, significance assessment of each one concludes that the gable end elevations are the least important of each and are in essence, detrimental as blank end walls within the conservation area. Both are of impressive Victorian scale and cannot be overwhelmed by a building that is not only not as tall, but which has all the other designed-in mitigating factors explained above. Far from overcrowding these buildings, the proposed new house makes sensible and sensitive use of a site that is currently detrimental to the significance of the conservation area.
3.17	<i>In terms of detailed design, the unadorned, block form of the design is a clear contrast to its more ornate and elegant neighbours. The large expanses of brick and proportions of the fenestration</i>	Purcell has not relied on the modern buildings elsewhere on the street to justify the proposals, but rather argued the articulation of the facades, height, massing and palette of

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
	<i>does not relate to the neighbouring buildings with their white rendered ground floors and more vertically proportioned windows. The design appears to be justified by the modern infills seen elsewhere along Inverness Street whilst the choice of brick has been chosen to match the extension to the Cavendish School further down the road. Corresponding to the character of the wider area is not sufficient for this extremely sensitive site in between two listed buildings in a conservation area.</i>	materials, in reference to the listed buildings and the conservation area. Layered on that, there was of course a considerable amount of design effort to respond to the wider context. As above, this has been evolved as a contextually modern piece of conservation architecture, not as an obvious reflector, or competitor, to the surrounding buildings. Taking certain design cues and evolving them into an architecture of addition remains at the core of Purcell's approach when designing in any historic environment and those principles are in evidence in the rhythm, set-backs and building lines of the proposed house.
3.18	<i>An assessment and evaluation of the scheme needs to be carried out in accordance with the requirements and tests within chapter 66 and 72 of the NPPF 2019 regarding any impact and level of harm caused to the significance of designated heritage assets, i.e. the adjoining listed building and the surrounding and adjacent conservation areas.</i>	The Heritage Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment conducted by Purcell looked in substantial and thorough detail at the surrounding context and evaluated the scheme against all relevant national, regional and local planning policy guidance. The contextual understanding of the area surrounding the site was also addressed in a study of relatable 'gap sites' within both of the conservation areas.
3.19	<i>NPPF para 192 requires that those assessing applications take account of 'the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.' Para 193 states that, 'When considering the</i>	As previously stated, the desirability of sustaining the heritage assets, both physically connected and in the surrounding historic built environment context, are what lies behind the need to improve the current situation on the site.

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
	<i>impact of a proposed development on the significance of a heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation', and para 194 states that 'Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification'. Substantial harm to a grade II listed building of any grade should be exceptional. Where the harm to a designated heritage asset is 'less than substantial', para 196 advises that 'this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use.'</i>	
3.20	<i>The existing low single storey structure has an important role to play in the significance of the two adjacent Grade II listed properties, as it indicates how the two historic streets have developed and provides them with breathing space. Infilling this area with a two-storey structure conceals the distinction between the two streets to the detriment of the setting of two listed buildings. The proposed building also projects beyond the listed side entrance of no.24 Gloucester Crescent and the flank wall of no.44 Inverness Street, overwhelming the buildings and creating an awkward junction between the two forms.</i>	This is a subjective and arguable view of the proposed development and its future legibility within the conservation area and wider streetscape. New architecture that responds, and is subservient, to earlier forms, even with a shared materiality, will always be clearly legible as such. The distinction between the two streets will remain aesthetically intact precisely because of the variables in scale, rhythm and architectural style that distinguish the buildings on Inverness Street from those on Gloucester Terrace. As noted in the Heritage Assessment, the buildings on Inverness Street, display a considerable variety, particularly when considering the length of the street from the junction with Arlington Road. The mixture of scales,

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
		from large scale on either side at the junction to the smaller domestic terraces on both sides towards Gloucester Terrace, alters again to the expanse of render that is on the side elevation of No24. This constitutes a considerable upping of the scale between these two, the proposed dwelling will mediate whilst being subservient to both. Far from being an 'awkward junction', this new, considered approach represents a considerable amount of conservation effort and is the result of the careful and appreciative study of the heritage assets on either side. The manner in which the current building acts in any way as a facilitator in keeping the historic forms visible, is an accident of development and due to the scale, particularly that of Gloucester Terrace, and the legibility of the adjacent buildings it allows. This can be replicated despite the addition of another level.
3.21	<i>The applicant's Heritage Impact Assessment concludes that the existing building "detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings and should be replaced". It then goes on to argue that the proposed development would be an enhancement. However, the building is not beyond repair and as made clear by the NPPF, neglect is not a material planning consideration in considering the deteriorated state of a heritage asset (including Conservation Areas). Whilst not designated as making a positive or</i>	Purcell would stand firmly by the assessment of the current building detracting from the conservation area. The virtue of its scale and the resultant visibility it affords of the rear elevations of Gloucester Terrace and the greenery beyond, do not, in our view supersede, in heritage terms, it's anomalous nature at street-level. The defining characteristic of this end of the street is residential and the current building, is akin more to a commercial remnant than an additional or ancillary part of a

Paragraph number of Officer's Delegated Report	Statement within Delegated Report	Response
	<i>negative contribution to the conservation area by the Primrose Hill Conservation Area statement, officers consider the structure makes a neutral contribution. Its scale and submissive appearance is appropriate for its location and crucially does not detract as would the proposed development.</i>	dwelling. This scheme seeks to amend that.
3.22	<i>It is considered that the harm here to designated heritage assets is 'less than substantial'. This applies to the adjacent Grade II listed buildings, no.24 Gloucester Crescent, no.44 Inverness Street, the Primrose Hill conservation area and the Camden Town.</i>	We would concur and conclude that the less than substantial harm is fully justified in the Heritage Statement, in answer to the pre-application commentary from Camden and evident for the reasons given above.

#### CITED PLANNING POLICY

Reason number 1 cites planning policies D1 – Design and D2 – Heritage of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and it is therefore appropriate for reference to these. However, mindful of the need to avoid repetition and the foregoing assessment of the Council's Report, the Inspector is referred to paragraphs 5.7 and 5.8 of the Planning Statement; the contents of Table 1; the HIA; and the assessment by KM Heritage. Consequently, the proposals accord with these policies.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The Applicant has proactively and reactively engaged with the Council at pre-application stage. The Officers have formed an in principle view that nothing above ground floor level is acceptable in this location. The specialist advice and views of the architects and heritage consultants at Purcell in addition to that of KM Heritage refute this stance. The proposals also have the overall support from the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee. Whilst there are five cited reasons for refusal, only number 1 is being pursued given that 2-5 can be addressed by a s106 Agreement. The approval of this new dwelling, which will incorporate sustainable energy sources will allow for the release of 44 Inverness Street into the marketplace providing a family-sized dwelling whilst in time also providing a two-bedroomed house after the Applicant requires it.

Fundamentally, the proposals are considered to be policy compliant and that the objection rests with the subjective opinion of the Conservation Officer/Team. In addition, these proposals result in a more cohesive form of architecture that will preserve the character and appearance of this conservation area.

### PLANNING BALANCE

There are no other material considerations associated with the development. As such, the planning balance clearly lies in favour of the development proposals.

### CONCLUSION

In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, the proposals are acceptable in consideration of the development plan and as such, it is respectfully requested that the Inspector upholds this appeal given that the presumption is clearly in favour of planning permission being granted.

LM/May 2021