
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 January 2017

by Andrew McCormack BSc (Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13 February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/16/ 3160504

2nd Floor Flat, 9 Cliff Road, Camden, London NW1 9AN

- 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 Andrey Novikov against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/2694/P, dated 15 April 2016, was refused by notice dated 28 July 2016.
 - The development proposed is roof extension and changes to fenestration.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main reason is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the Camden Square Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is situated on the north west side of Cliff Road which is characterised by a series of three-storey plus basement semi-detached brick and render 19th Century villas. This pattern of development is interjected by the modernist architecture of Cliff Studios to the north east of the appeal property. The appeal property and adjacent buildings form part of a terrace incorporating Nos 8 to 15 Cliff Road which is unimpaired at roof level. Whilst it is acknowledged that the character of the surrounding area is mixed and that alterations to the roof level have taken place, the immediate terrace at roof level remains intact.
 4. Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy (Core Strategy) states that development is required to be of the highest standard of design that responds to local context and character and preserves and enhances the heritage assets of the area. Furthermore, Policies DP24 and 25 of the Camden Development Policies (DP) seek to ensure that development considers the character, setting context, form and scale of neighbouring buildings and takes account of conservation areas and other heritage assets where applicable.
 5. The Council's Design Guidance CPG1 advises that roof alterations are only likely to be acceptable when there is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape. I note
-

that in respect of the appeal proposal this is not the case as the proposal would be the first such addition on the immediate terrace of properties on the north side of Cliff Road. Furthermore, CPG1 indicates that additions and alterations would be unacceptable where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roofline that is largely unimpaired by alterations of additions, even where a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a co-ordinated design. I note that this would be applicable to the appeal proposal

6. Whilst the proposal would be set back from the front elevation to mitigate its prominence and impact on the roofline, the size and position of the extension, would still be visible from the public highway and the wider area. It would appear as a bulky and uncharacteristic roof profile which would be out of keeping with the unaltered parapet roof line of the terrace of properties. Furthermore, the extent of glazing on the front and rear elevations of the roof extension in combination with the proposed pitched roof would significantly alter the existing characteristics of the terrace.
7. Therefore, due to its design, bulk, scale and siting and having had regard to its location within the terrace, I find that the appeal proposal would appear as an incongruous roof form which would be contrary to the relevant local planning policies. Furthermore, it would have a harmful effect on the existing character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it forms a part and the wider CA. Notwithstanding this, whilst I have found harm to the character and appearance of the CA, this harm would be less than substantial.
8. As the proposed development is within the Camden Square CA, I have a duty under Section 72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Area Act 1990, as amended and Paragraphs 132 – 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) to pay special attention to the effect of the proposal in terms of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA. From all I have seen and read, I find that the proposal would have neither a preserving nor enhancing effect in this regard.
9. The appellant states that the wider area is mixed in character and architectural style and that there are other roof extensions nearby. Furthermore, both the Council and the appellant have drawn my attention to a number of other proposals and developments in the surrounding area which are intended to support their respective cases. I have had due regard to these points and other schemes. However, I must assess the appeal proposal on its own merits and circumstances. Accordingly, I have applied only limited weight to the other schemes in determining this appeal. Notwithstanding this, in my view, the impact of the proposal on the immediate terrace and group of properties would subsequently result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the CA.
10. I appreciate the appellant's points stating that the proposed development would create improvements in terms of increased living accommodation and that this would bring benefits and enhanced living conditions for the appellant and other occupiers of the appeal property. Despite this, I find that these benefits would not outweigh the harm I have identified to the character and appearance of the property, the terrace of properties and the wider CA.
11. Consequently, I conclude that the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, including the Camden Square Conservation Area. Therefore, it would be contrary to Policy

CS14 of the Core Strategy and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the DP. Amongst other matters, these policies seek to ensure that development is of high quality design and conserves, preserves or enhances the character, appearance and significance of local heritage assets, including conservation areas.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons, and having had regard for all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Andrew McCormack

INSPECTOR