



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Nick Palmer BA (Hons) BPI MRTPI

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

Decision date: 7 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3173322
30 Harmood Street, London NW1 8DJ

- 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 Cormac McNabb against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/6020/P, dated 1 November 2016, was refused by notice dated 31 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is extensions to a single family terraced dwelling house: 2nd floor rear extension, 2 N^o new roof windows to butterfly roof and ground and first floor infill with extended ground floor extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council's reason for refusal concerns only the proposed second floor extension. Accordingly I shall examine only that part of the proposal as forming the main issue between the parties.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposed second floor extension on the character and appearance of the area including its effect on the Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of a mid-19th century terrace of houses which is in the Harmood Street Conservation Area. The houses are of two storeys and of brick with parapet walls and concealed butterfly roofs and are set back behind small front gardens. Clarence Way extends to the side of the terrace and Harmood Grove is to the rear. From those routes the rear of the terrace is seen including the butterfly roofs and two storey rear wings although a number of properties in the terrace have been extended at the rear including at roof level. The Harmood Street Conservation Area Statement identifies the terraces including that containing the appeal property as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. The dwellings are described as having a 'cottage' character and as remaining largely unaltered.
5. The proposed second floor extension would extend above the existing roof and the rear wing and would have a flat roof. It is proposed to be faced with zinc

cladding although the appellant would be willing to discuss the material and would accept a condition in this respect. I saw on my visit that there are already a number of similar rear second floor extensions in the terrace which are towards its southern end. The northern end of the terrace which includes the appeal property, by contrast retains its original form at roof level.

6. Many of the existing extensions appear to pre-date the designation of the Conservation Area in 2005 including a large roof extension at Nº 22 which is visible from the front of the terrace. Two roof extensions have been approved since then at Nºs 18 and 26 but the Council nevertheless considers that these are harmful to the character of the terrace. The existing roof extensions disrupt the original form of the terrace when seen from the rear but they are concentrated at the less visible end of the terrace. The northern end is more visible from the public realm as it is nearer to Clarence Way and Harmood Grove. For this reason the unspoilt part of the terrace is of value to the character and appearance of the area.
7. The Camden Planning Guidance: Design (CPG 1) (2015) states that extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation. Rear extensions should respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building including its architectural period and style. Paragraph 4.13 of the guidance states that in most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level will be strongly discouraged. That paragraph goes on to recognise that the height of neighbouring projections and extensions may be considered as part of the context. While the existing extensions form part of the context the proposal would be within a distinct part of the terrace that retains its original form and for this reason would be harmful.
8. I take into account the partial screening effect that the rear projections of the adjacent houses to the north would have but the extension would still be visible from Clarence Way and Harmood Grove as well as from the residential building on the latter route. I saw that there is a brick wall along the rear of the Harmood Street properties and noted the steel garage door inset into that wall. These features while dominant in the foreground would not alter the disruptive effect of the proposal at roof level and its prominence in this respect.
9. For the reasons given the second floor extension would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. The harm to the Conservation Area would be less than substantial because the terrace has already been extended at roof level. Although the proposal would provide improved family accommodation this public benefit would be limited and not sufficient to outweigh the great weight that I give to conservation of the heritage asset. For these reasons I conclude that the proposed second floor extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area.
10. Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy (2010) requires development to respect local context and character and preservation and enhancement of heritage assets including conservation areas. Policy DP25 of the Camden Development Policies (2010) also has the latter requirement while policy DP24 requires a high standard of design that considers the character and proportions of the building. For the reasons given the proposed second floor extension would not accord with those policies.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Nick Palmer

INSPECTOR