Date: 02/03/2023 PINS Ref: APP/X5210/W/22/3309035 Our Ref: 2022/1323/P Contact: Ewan Campbell Direct Line: +44 20 7974 5458 Ewan.campbell@camden.gov.uk

Roxanne Gold The Planning Inspectorate 3C Eagle Wing Temple Quay House

#### Temple Quay House 2 The Square Bristol BS1 6PN

# Camden

#### Planning and Regeneration

Culture & Environment Directorate London Borough of Camden 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG

Tel: 020 7974 6751 www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Ms Gold,

## Appeal site: Flat C, 66 Priory Road, London, NW6 3RE Appeal by: Mr Steve Hooper

#### Proposal: Erection of first floor side/rear mansard roof extension

I refer to the above appeal against the Council's refusal to grant planning permission. The Council's case is set out in the Officer's delegated report. The report details the application site and surroundings, the site history and an assessment of the proposal. A copy of the report was sent with the questionnaire.

In addition to the information sent with the questionnaire, I would be pleased if the Inspector could take into account the following information and comments before deciding the appeal.

## 1. Summary

- 1.1. The application site, 66 Priory Road, contains a three-storey semi-detached dwellinghouse consisting of four flats (Class C3) situated on the eastern side of Priory Road.
- 1.2. The area is characterised by residential properties. The site is located in the South Hampstead Conservation Area and, while not listed, the building on the site is identified in the Conservation Area Statement as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 1.3. The planning application which is the subject of this appeal was refused for the following reasons:
  - 1. The proposed mansard roof extension, by virtue of its location, design, bulk and materiality, would result in an incongruous and awkward addition to the existing building. This addition would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building, the local roofscape and the South Hampstead Conservation Area, contrary to Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 1.4. The reason for refusal is fully addressed in the delegated report and not repeated here. The appellants grounds of appeal are also addressed.

#### 2. Status of policies and guidance

- 2.1. In determining the mentioned application, the London Borough of Camden had regard to the relevant legislation, government guidance, statutory development plans and the particular circumstances of the case.
- 2.2. The London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan) was formally adopted on 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2017. The following policies in the Local Plan are considered to be relevant to the determination of the appeal:
  - Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth
  - Policy D1 Design
  - Policy D2 Heritage
  - Policy A1 Managing the impact of development
  - Policy A3 Biodiversity
- 2.3 The Council also refers to supporting guidance in Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) documents. The CPG documents most relevant to the proposal are as follows: Home Improvements, Trees and Amenity. The Camden Planning

Guidance documents were subject to public consultation and were approved by the Council on 15 March 2019 and 26 March 2018.

- <u>CPG Home Improvements (2021)</u>
- <u>CPG Amenity (2021)</u>
- <u>CPG Biodiversity (2018)</u>
- 2.4 The National Planning Policy Framework was published in April 2012 and revised in March 2021. It states that proposed development should be refused if it conflicts with the local plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. There are no material differences between the Council's adopted policies and the NPPF in relation to this appeal. The full text of the relevant adopted policies was sent with the questionnaire documents.
- 2.5 The Council's adopted policies are recent and up to date and should be accorded full weight in accordance with paragraphs 31 33 and 213 of the NPPF.
- 2.6 There are no material differences between the NPPF and the Council's adopted policies in relation to this appeal.

## 3. Comments on appellant's grounds of appeal

3.1 The appellant has put forward their grounds of appeal, which will be responded to.

Ground A: Impact of the proposed extension on the existing building and the local roofscape

- 3.2 The appellant in paragraph 6.13 references the extension being 'proportionate' and represents 'gentle intensification'. However it is not clear what the extension is 'proportionate' to; if it's the scale of the property then this adds further bulk and scale to a point of incongruousness or if it's the design then the mansard roof sits awkwardly just below the main roof eaves and is not a common roof design at this level. It is not clear what gentle densification is but considering the extension is incongruous and is built upon an existing two storey extension it is clear that is not particularly 'gentle'
- 3.3 In paragraph 6.14 it states that 'the existing visual hierarchy of the building...will remain intact' however to the rear of the building that is exactly what is being removed and the rear projection set in from the side, as outlined in the officer report, will be lost.

- 3.4 In paragraph 6.14 it is claimed the proposal complies with the London Plan policy D3 (Optimising site capacity through the design-led approach) however the proposal fails the first (and 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> point) in that the design does not respect local context and the local distinctiveness.
- 3.5 Paragraph 6.15 claims that *There will not be the risk of creating a pastiche effect, nor jarring and punchy contemporary additions draining attention away from the group value of the buildings* it is not clear why there wouldn't be considering the proximity to the main roof, second floor location and its visible nature.
- 3.6 Whilst some of the CPG points outlined in 6.16 are clearly not relevant here including, *The architectural features of the existing building, The proportions, style and original design of the Victorian building will be preserved*, what is important to point out, which was also mentioned in the officer report, is that the building already has significant extensions added to the property which already contribute to the erosion of the character of the rear elevation. This extension is not the first and should not be considered in isolation of the existing development on site.
- 3.7 Paragraph 6.20 states that there is planning precedent at no.68 in terms of this proposal. The 1987 approved extension is not considered a positive introduction and negatively impacts the character of the building. The Council's current policies are materially different to the policies in 1987 and are more specific in terms of conservation. The precedent argument should not just be applied based on its existence.
- 3.8 It is not considered that conditions would mitigate the impact of the development as set out above and the suggested conditions below would secure compliance with the proposal.

#### 4. Conclusion

- 4.1 Based on the information set out above, and having taken account of all the appellant's arguments and additional information submitted, the Council maintains that the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and
- 4.2 The information submitted by the appellant in support of the appeal does not overcome or address the Council's concerns. The proposal would conflict with policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan. These policies seek to ensure that all development respects local context and character, preserves heritage assets and that public benefits convincingly outweigh any less than substantial harm when the special interest of a non-designated heritage asset cannot be

preserved. Indeed, the proposal is not considered to present any public benefits that would outweigh the harm identified.

- 4.3 For these reasons the Inspector is respectfully requested to dismiss the appeal. However, should the Inspector be minded to approve the appeal, suggested conditions are included in Appendix A.
- 4.4 If any further clarification of the appeal submission is required please do not hesitate to contact Ewan Campbell on the above direct dial number or email address.

Yours sincerely,

Ewan Campbell Planning Officer Regeneration and Planning Supporting Communities

## Conditions

1	The development hereby permitted must be begun not later than the end of three years from the date of this permission. Reason: In order to comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country
	Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
2	All new external work shall be carried out in materials that resemble, as closely as possible, in colour and texture those of the existing building, unless otherwise specified in the approved application.
	Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
3	The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 173-IN-050, 173-IN-051, 173-IN-052, 173-IN-103, 173-IN-105, 173-IN-200, 173-IN-201, 173-GA-101-B, 173-GA-105, 173-GA-200, 173-GA-201, Heritage Statement (28th March 2022)
	Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

## Informatives

1	This approval does not authorise the use of the public highway. Any requirement to
	use the public highway, such as for hoardings, temporary road closures and
	suspension of parking bays, will be subject to approval of relevant licence from the
	Council's Streetworks Authorisations & Compliance Team London Borough of Camden
	5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE (Tel. No 020 7974
	4444). Licences and authorisations need to be sought in advance of proposed works.
	Where development is subject to a Construction Management Plan (through a
	requirement in a S106 agreement), no licence or authorisation will be granted until the
	Construction Management Plan is approved by the Council.
2	All works should be conducted in accordance with the Camden Minimum

2 All works should be conducted in accordance with the Camden Minimum Requirements - a copy is available on the Council's website at https://beta.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/1269042/Camden+Minimum+Requ irements+%281%29.pdf/bb2cd0a2-88b1-aa6d-61f9-525ca0f71319 or contact the Council's Noise and Licensing Enforcement Team, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE (Tel. No. 020 7974 4444) Noise from demolition and construction works is subject to control under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. You must carry out any building works that can be heard at the boundary of the site only between 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays. You must secure the approval of the Council's Noise and Licensing Enforcement Team prior to undertaking such activities outside these hours.

- L		
	3	Your proposals may be subject to control under the Building Regulations and/or the
		London Buildings Acts that cover aspects including fire and emergency escape,
		access and facilities for people with disabilities and sound insulation between
		dwellings. You are advised to consult the Council's Building Control Service,
		Camden Town Hall, Judd St, Kings Cross, London NW1 2QS (tel: 020-7974 6941).