



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 14 September 2020

by **G D Jones BSc(Hons) DipTP DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 September 2020

Appeal A - Ref: APP/X5210/Y/20/3249781

5A Greville Place, London NW6 5JP

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A Gagen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2019/5406/L, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2020.
 - The works proposed are described as *erection of roof extension and minor alteration to front elevation, widening entrance door*.
-

Appeal B - Ref: APP/X5210/D/20/3255723

5A Greville Place, London NW6 5JP

- 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 A Gagen against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2019/4709/P, dated 2 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as described as *erection of roof extension and minor alteration to front elevation, widening entrance door*.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed and listed building consent is refused for proposed works described as the erection of roof extension and minor alteration to front elevation, widening entrance door.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

3. As the proposal is in a conservation area and relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2), 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issues

4. The main issues are:
 - In respect to both appeals, whether the proposal would preserve a Grade II listed building, 5 and 5A Greville Place, and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses and the extent to which it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the St John's Wood Conservation Area; and

- In respect to Appeal B only, the effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupants of 3B Greville Place, having particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Listed Building & Conservation Area (Appeals A & B)

5. The appeal site comprises 5A Greville Place, a single dwelling. No 5A and the adjoining No 5, which is also a separate dwelling, are a listed building at Grade II. Both lie within the St John's Wood Conservation Area (the SJWCA).
6. This part of Greville Place is largely residential, including large family dwellings set back from the street in substantial gardens, with mature street trees and trees in private gardens, features that contribute significantly to the character and appearance of the SJWCA. It is principally from these characteristics that the SJWCA's significance is derived.
7. The listed building dates from the early 19th Century. Nonetheless, the evidence indicates that it has been subject to extension and alteration, particularly to No 5A. This includes the formation of its current full depth and width first floor with flat roof above, which occurred at some point between 1978 and 1999. What is now No 5 was built as the main house, while what has become No 5A was its stables or coach-house. Given No 5A's original ancillary use and appearance, and as it has subsequently been much altered, the significance and special interest of the listed building lies primarily in what is now No 5, as a good example of a vernacular house that is typical of the SJWCA.
8. Notwithstanding the alterations that have been made to No 5A, it continues to appear subservient to No 5. This is principally because it is set back and down from No 5 and as it has a narrower frontage.
9. The proposals include what would be a reasonably substantial new mansard roof above the existing, rather cubic, form of No 5A to create a second floor, including three bedrooms. The rear gable would follow the profile of the mansard form, while the front, to Greville Place, would feature a triangular pediment. Due to its size, form, siting and prominence, the proposed second floor development would visually and architecturally compete with No 5, undermining its legibility as the main house, thereby harming the significance and special interest of the listed building at large. The harm to the listed building, as a villa that is typical of the historic development of the area, would also be significantly detrimental to the significance of the SJWCA.
10. In making these assessments I have considered all of the evidence, including that No 5A used to have a mansard roof at first floor and that there are examples of development in the surrounding area that have certain parallels to what is proposed, including the triangular gable of the adjoining, 3B Greville Place. However, as described above, it is the historical and architectural relationship with and effect on the host listed building, particularly that part of it that now forms No 5, which distinguishes the appeal proposals from those other developments, past and present.
11. I have also taken into account that planning permission has previously been granted for development at No 5A that included a new pitched roof. Assuming

that that development could and were to proceed in the event that these appeals were to be dismissed, the resulting roof to No 5A would be very different to that of the appeals scheme in terms of mass, form and design, and would be much more in keeping with the existing hipped roof form of No 5. Consequently, I give this potential alternative scheme little weight.

12. The resulting harm to the listed building's and to the SJWCA's significance would both be less than substantial in the terms of para 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Given the statutory duties outlined above regarding listed buildings and conservation areas, the identified harm to the two heritage assets each carry substantial weight against the proposed development, such that they comfortably outweigh the relatively modest public benefits suggested.
13. Therefore, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the Grade II listed building and the character and appearance of the SJWCA, thus failing to satisfy the requirements of the Act and para 192 of the Framework. It would also conflict with Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan). This conclusion is sufficient on its own to justify dismissing both appeals.

Living Conditions (Appeal B only)

14. Four roof lights are proposed to the side elevation of the proposed mansard roof that would face No 3B. There are existing roof lights to the nearby roof form of No 3B, such that there would be potential for overlooking from the proposed development. Without an internal viewing from No 3B via those roof lights or more conclusive evidence showing this relationship, it is not entirely clear to what extent there would or would not be overlooking.
15. In any event, as proposed Bedroom 3 would have a substantial, rear-facing window overlooking the garden, two of the proposed roof lights would serve as secondary windows to that room, while the other two would serve the stairs and the landing area only. Accordingly, if it were found that there would be unacceptable overlooking from these proposed roof lights, I see no reason why controls could not be put in place to ensure that they were fitted with obscured glazing and fixed closed, thereby preventing overlooking without unreasonably effecting the living conditions of residents of the appeal site.
16. On this basis, the proposed development need not have a significant effect on the living conditions of the occupants of 3B Greville Place, having particular regard to privacy. Consequently, in that regard it, would accord with Local Plan Policy A1 (Managing the Impact of Development).

Conclusions

17. For the above reasons, notwithstanding my finding in respect to the second main issue, I conclude that both appeals should be dismissed.

G D Jones

INSPECTOR