



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 30 January 2023

by **L Wilson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

**Decision date: 14 February 2023**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3305191**

**106 Torriano Avenue, London NW5 2SD**

- 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 Sheikh against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2021/6183/P, dated 25 January 2022, was refused by notice dated 3 May 2022.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey first floor rear extension with a rear and side window and side door and an enlargement of the existing roof extension to accommodate a staircase.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey first floor rear extension with a rear and side window and side door and an enlargement of the existing roof extension to accommodate a staircase at 106 Torriano Avenue, London NW5 2SD in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 2021/6183/P, dated 25 January 2022, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
  - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 000 PL1 (Site location plan), 100 PL1 (Proposed first floor plan), 101 PL1 (Proposed second floor plan), 102 PL1 (Proposed third floor plan), 103 PL1 (Proposed roof plan), 200 PL1 (Proposed section AA), 201 PL1 (Proposed section BB), 202 PL1 (Proposed section CC), 300 PL1 (Proposed front elevation) and 301 PL1 (Proposed rear elevation).
  - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall be those specified in the submitted Application Form and Design & Access Statement (dated December 2021).

### Main Issue

2. The Council confirm in the officer's report that the rear extension is acceptable, and I see no reason to disagree. The reason for refusal relates solely to the proposed roof extension of the development.
3. Therefore, the main issue is the effect of the proposed roof extension on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area.

## Reasons

4. No 106 is a town house that has been divided into two flats. The building forms part of a terrace that has been identified in the Camden's Local List as being a non-designated heritage asset. The significance of the locally listed building is derived from pediments with central bays, chimney stacks with pots, timber sliding sash windows, and iron balconies at first floor. When viewed from Torriano Avenue the terrace is seen as a well preserved and high quality group that positively contributes to the locality.
5. This part of Torriano Avenue is characterised by properties of similar architectural styles and age, as well as McCrone House and Apollo Studios. The design, form and scale of McCrone House and Apollo Studios significantly differ to the terraces.
6. The host building has an existing metal-clad roof extension. I understand that that the roof extension was not built in accordance with the approved plans but it is immune from enforcement action. The scheme seeks to enlarge the roof extension.
7. The proposed roof extension would not be widely visible from Torriano Avenue due to the set back from the front elevation, and location on the roof. The extension would be more visible from neighbouring rear gardens and Charlton King's Road to the rear.
8. The rear elevation of the host property, and wider terrace, has significantly less architectural features that contribute to the significance of the non-designated heritage asset than the front elevation. It also has considerably less uniformity due to a number of the properties been extended to the rear. Nonetheless, those extensions are not to the roof.
9. The surrounding area has a varied roofscape including flat roofs, pitched roofs, mansards and modern roof forms. For example, adjacent to No 104 is a relatively modern roof addition, which appears to relate to Apollo Studios. Due to that building's height, scale and materials (white render, grey windows and perforated metal balustrade), it is significantly more dominant in the street scene than the proposal before me would be.
10. In my view, although the existing roof extension is unusual and is not a feature seen elsewhere, it does not negatively contribute to the locally listed building or the wider area. This is due to its modest scale, siting (stepped back from the rear elevation), the glazing helps it to appear as a lightweight addition, it does not detract from the architectural features of the building, and the character and appearance of buildings vary in the locality. Furthermore, the appellant highlights that the terrace was listed after the roof extension was constructed.
11. The pitch of the roof has been designed to read as a continuation of the existing rooftop extension and would not diminish the architectural features of the locally listed building. The proposed development would be a modest addition and, taking into account, the current roof extension and varied roofscape, it would be appropriately designed. Accordingly, the scheme would not unduly increase the prominence of the roof extension, including from longer views.
12. Having regard to the existing character and appearance of the locally listed building, as well as the siting and modest size of the extension, and the varied

roofscape, the proposed development would be a sympathetic addition and would respect local context and character. The proposal would not result in an incongruous or dominant addition. Accordingly, the architectural integrity of the host building and terrace would not be compromised, and the proposal would not harm the significance of the non-designated heritage asset.

13. For these reasons and having regard to the roof extension's location, design, bulk and massing, the proposal would not have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area. Consequently, it would comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan (2017) and Policies D3 and D4 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016). These seek, amongst other matters, to ensure that development respects local context and character. Furthermore, the Council will seek to protect non-designated heritage assets and the effect of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, balancing the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

### **Conditions**

14. It is necessary to attach a condition specifying the approved plan as this provides certainty. A condition relating to materials is also necessary in order to preserve the character and appearance of the area and locally listed building.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons given above, having considered the development plan as a whole, and all other material considerations, the appeal is allowed subject to the attached conditions.

*L Wilson*

INSPECTOR