



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 13 June 2022

by Andrew Smith BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27th July 2022

Appeal A Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3292254

43 Georgiana Street, London NW1 0EB

- 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 Karl Baumgarten against the decision of London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2020/3381/P, dated 30 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2021.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as: 'Mansard roof extension to form new timber floor'.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/X5210/Y/22/3292267

43 Georgiana Street, London NW1 0EB

- 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 Karl Baumgarten against the decision of London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2020/3904/L, dated 30 July 2020, was refused by notice dated 26 November 2021.
 - The works proposed are described on the application form as: 'Mansard roof extension to form new timber floor'.
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. These decisions address planning and listed building consent appeals for the same site and the same scheme. Whilst the remit of each regime is different, the main issue set out below relates to both appeals. Indeed, to reduce repetition and for the avoidance of doubt, I have dealt with both appeals together within a single decision letter whilst having regard to the statutory duties that apply under Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act).

Main Issue

3. The main issue, common to both appeals, is whether or not the proposal would preserve the Grade II listed building known as 'Numbers 32 to 53 and attached railings, 32-53, Georgiana Street' (the listed building) and any of the features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses.

Reasons

Significance and special interest

4. The listed building comprises a linear terrace of 22 three-storey plus basement townhouses, with rusticated stucco ground floors and stock brick upper storeys below a continuous parapet. According to the statutory list description (List Entry Number: 1342068), the listed building dates to the early nineteenth century and was subsequently restored as part of a Greater London Council renovation scheme in the late twentieth century.
5. The significance and special interest of the listed building is drawn, in part, from its age, plan form, architectural composition, detailing and materials that collectively reflect its early nineteenth century origins. This significance and special interest is further underpinned by the homogeneity of the listed building's principal frontage and the uniformity of its roofscape, which is comprised of repeated 'butterfly' roof forms positioned between routinely spaced chimney stacks and behind a continual parapet. Indeed, the listed building's homogeneity is reflected in identification of its group value (GV) within the statutory list description.
6. The appeal property comprises the upper two floors of No 43 Georgiana Street (No. 43), which has been subject to past internal alterations through subdivision into flats. Despite changes and adaptations over time, the external elevations and roof form at No. 43 have not been markedly altered. Thus, No. 43 reads as a consistent and readily interpretable component of the wider listed building, and thereby contributes to its significance and special interest as an entity.

The proposed works and development

7. The proposal is to introduce a mansard roof extension at No. 43 to provide additional accommodation, accessed via a new stair up from the first floor. The proposed mansard would be set in slightly from the front and rear building lines of No. 43 and slope up to a flat roof, the height of which would be below the side stacks and just above the rear chimney stack. I also acknowledge that complimentary fenestration is proposed, which would reference the proportions and placement of existing window openings.
8. Even so, the authenticity of the extant butterfly roof form at No. 43 would be lost whilst internally the additional stair and roof-level accommodation would undermine legibility of the building's historic layout and plan form. In the context of the consistency of the wider listed building's roofscape, the extension would represent an insensitive and uncharacteristic addition and would have a prominent high-level presence at odds with the unimpaired roofline that presently prevails. Furthermore, the proposals would contribute to an incremental erosion of homogeneity within the terrace, weakening the architecturally-ordered, consistent form and group value of the Grade II listed building as an entity, to the detriment of its special interest and significance.
9. For the above reasons, the proposal would fail to preserve the listed building's special interest. It follows that conflict arises with Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Act, which apply irrespective of the site's position outside of any designated conservation area. Bearing in mind the scale and nature of the proposals on the listed building as an entity, the degree of harm to the significance of the

listed building as a designated heritage asset, would, under the terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (July 2021) (the Framework), be less than substantial. The Framework requires less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

10. The scheme would increase the living space at No. 43 and, to some extent, represent an investment into the fabric of the listed building and local housing stock. However, such improvements would primarily cater for the requirements of the appellant on a private basis, which would be of minimal wider public benefit which carries very little weight in the scheme's favour. No case has been made that the proposal would secure the optimum viable use of the asset. The appeal site is outside of a conservation area and the proposed works and development would preserve the setting and significance of other designated heritage assets, including the Grade II listed terrace on the opposite side of Georgiana Street. These are neutral considerations however, that weigh neither in favour nor against the appeal scheme.
11. This leads me to conclude that, even cumulatively, the public benefits associated with the appeal proposal do not outweigh the less than substantial harm that I have identified would be caused to the significance of the listed building as a designated heritage asset. Even if the degree of harm would be towards the lower end of the less than substantial scale, it still carries considerable importance and weight. Conflict therefore arises with the historic environment policies contained within the Framework.
12. Conflict also arises with Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan (2017) in so far as these policies require development to respect local context and character and set out that Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings shall be preserved.

Other Matters

13. My attention has been drawn to various examples of and/or permissions for similar-style mansard roof extensions affecting listed buildings nearby, including at Nos. 27 and 40 Georgiana Street. I do not know the planning policy considerations in those instances and my decision is relevant to the evidence and circumstances before me. Furthermore, some roof extensions that I saw only served to emphasise to me the harmful impact such alterations can have on the architectural composition and continuity of a terrace. I therefore do not consider that the presence of other roof extensions justifies allowing works and development that I have found would fail to preserve a listed building.

Conclusion

14. For the above reasons, I conclude that both Appeal A and Appeal B should be dismissed.

Andrew Smith

INSPECTOR