
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2016

by Graeme Robbie BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 25 November 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/16/3157095
49 Hartland Road, London NW1 8DB

- 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 & Mrs Cakir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/3025/P, dated 27 May 2016, was refused by notice dated 2 August 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Cakir against the Council of the London Borough of Camden. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site lies towards the end of a long terraced row of properties on the north western side of Hartland Road. The terrace, although a continuous built form between its junction with Chalk Farm Road to the south, and the railway over-bridge to the north, comprises two distinct sections of character. The longer portion of the terrace, running from the Chalk Farm Road, is comprised almost exclusively of two storey terraced dwellings with additional storeys provided by mansard roofs. The dwellings within the remaining shorter portion of the terrace, which includes the appeal property, are taller, more substantial, three storey terraced properties.
 5. However, where the first portion of the terrace displays a consistency of design and scale through the front parapet walls and the regular rhythm of the dormer windows within each of the mansard roof frontages, the latter displays an equal degree of consistency in design and appearance through the strong and consistent unbroken parapet wall and roofline. Although the decorative detailing of the parapet walls vary from building to building, the overall roofline
-

remains consistent across this particular block, punctuated only by the distinctive chimney blocks on the intervening party parapet walls. So too is this evident from the rear. Whilst partly masked by the substantial new building to the rear of this part of Hartland Road, the unaltered rise and fall of the valley roofs and rear walls of this part of the terrace are evident across the intervening rear gardens.

6. I find that the consistent, uniform roofline of this part of Hartland Road displays considerable architectural integrity. Whilst exhibiting differing characteristics to the part of the terrace at the Chalk Farm Road end, it is nonetheless an important contributing factor to the character and appearance of the surrounding area. As such, although neither listed nor lying within a conservation area, it lies within a group of houses identified by the Council in a local list of non-designated heritage assets. Notwithstanding the two distinct visual character areas of Hartland Road, the uniformity of the street, in terms of its scale and form, is noted as contributing to the townscape and giving the street a distinctive and idiosyncratic character.
7. Paragraphs 5.6 – 5.10 of the Camden Supplementary Planning Document, Camden Planning Guidance: Design (CPG1) set out the general principles relating to roof alterations. It states that roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. This may occur where, for example and amongst other examples, there is an otherwise unbroken run of valley roofs or complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roofline largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions. The CPG1 is a material consideration of relevance to the proposed development, to which I attach significant weight.
8. In this instance, the proposed roof extension would be set back from the existing front parapet wall. Indeed, the submitted plans indicate it would be set back sufficient distance from the parapet wall so as to render its party walls, its glazed front face and its flat roof hidden from street-level views. However, in longer viewpoints from the rear, including properties on Clarence Way, or more elevated viewpoints such as the upper floor windows of the properties opposite and the nearby elevated railway line, the extension would be a jarring and prominent feature within the immediate roofscape. From these aspects the mansard extension would protrude above the consistently uniform parapet wall. Its substantial, built-up, flank walls and mid-terrace position amongst an unaltered and unadorned roofscape would make it an incongruous and obtrusive addition to the roof.
9. Whilst mansard roof extensions are not an uncommon feature within Hartland Road and its surrounding streets, the particular group of buildings that the appeal site lies within shares a visually distinct, uniform and intact character section of terrace where no such features exist. The extension, with its heavily glazed front elevation, would introduce a discordant, jarring and incongruously modern feature at odds with the character and appearance of the host building. In so doing, it would erode the visual uniformity of an otherwise unadorned and unaltered roofscape created in large part by the parapet walls and the regular rise-and-fall rhythm of the valley roofs.
10. Therefore, whilst the proposed mansard would not be visible in street-level views from Hartland Road, it would be visible from the upper floors of nearby

dwelling, and from passing trains on the nearby elevated rail line. The lack of street-level public views is, however, no basis for allowing the proposal given the harm that I have otherwise found that the proposal would cause to the character and appearance of the host building and to the surrounding area.

11. Thus, for these reasons, I conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, and to the visually distinct group of buildings at 35 – 55 Hartland Road within which the appeal property lies. As such, the proposal would be contrary to policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy and policy DP24 of the Camden Development Policies, as supported by the Council's SPD, CPG1: Design. Together, these policies require development to be of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character, and the scale, setting and form of neighbouring buildings. For the same reasons, the proposal would be at odds with the National Planning Policy Framework which seeks, as one of its core planning principles, to secure high quality design.
12. I have noted that the appellant has sought to address the concerns raised by the Council and the Inspector¹ in respect of the original scheme. I have, however, considered the current proposal on its merits, and I find that it would, in the form before me, be a substantial, incongruous and jarring addition to the roof of the appeal property. I have also been referred to another appeal decision² relating to a mansard roof extension at 14 Healey Street. However, from the evidence before me, the schemes and the context of the respective properties in these two instances differ from each other, and I have therefore given that matter limited weight.
13. I have also been referred to further examples of mansard roofs on two groups of properties in Hadley Street, both of which are also identified on the Council's Local List of non-designated heritages assets. However, I do not have the details of those schemes before me, and so I cannot be certain that the circumstances are the same. I have, in any event, determined the appeal on its own merits and have reached my conclusions on the appeal proposal on the basis of the evidence before me.

Other Matters

14. I have noted the lack of objection to the proposal from occupiers of neighbouring properties. I note, too, the appellant's reasons for the proposal. However, these do not provide compelling reasons to allow the appeal in the context of the harm that I have identified above.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons set out above, and having considered all other matters raised, I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

Graeme Robbie

INSPECTOR

¹ APP/X5210/D/15/3138053

² APP/X5210/D/12/2168834