
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 October 2020 by A J Sutton BA Hons DipTP MRTPI

by R C Kirby BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 November 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/20/3252602

25 St Paul's Mews, London, NW1 9TZ

- 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 Vellone against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2019/4660/P, dated 12 September 2019, was refused by notice dated 4 March 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Part demolition of existing hipped roof and adjoining pitched roof, erection of new gable roof extension, erection of new rear dormer, creation of two new roof lights to the front roof pitch.'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host building and the Camden Square Conservation Area (Conservation Area).

Reasons for Recommendation

4. The appeal property is an attractive mid-terrace dwelling situated in a modern gated mews within the Conservation Area. The uniformed character of the front of the terrace is largely screened from public view. This consistency in form does not continue to the rear where the appeal property forms a staggered building line. Some dormer additions are apparent at the rear of the terrace, where the roofscape is partially visible from Maiden Lane.
5. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires me to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. In this respect national policy on heritage assets, which includes conservation areas, is set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). At paragraph 192, it sets out matters which should be taken into account including sustaining and

enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness.

6. The Conservation Area is principally a 19th Century inner London suburb, with a gridded street layout focused on the Square. Beyond the Square the architecture is not uniformed, with mews like developments that have evolved over time. The St Paul's Mews is a 20th Century addition of a homogeneous composition, with an elegant double curved form fronting a driveway. The architectural interest of the roof is its simple curving form and consistency of materials. The narrow hipped section on the appeal property appears as an understated detail and in this respect is an integral part of the roofscape's pleasing design.
7. The proposal would reconfigure a small section of hipped roof to create a partial gable which would allow the fenestration of the proposed dormer to align with existing windows at the rear of the property.
8. The proposed gable would have a similar profile to the existing hipped roof. However, it would introduce an alien form and materials at roof level. Whilst matching materials of the elevation, the brick form would appear a prominent and inharmonious feature in the existing roofscape. The uncharacteristic detail would be highlighted by the proposed timber barge board. As such the coherency of the roof would be harmfully disrupted, and the original architectural integrity of the terrace would be diminished. Although the harmful development would not be widely visible, it would erode the contribution the host property and terrace as a whole makes to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In doing so, the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.
9. The proposed dormer has been designed cognisant of Camden Planning Guidance Altering and Extending Your Home 2019. The design in itself would not be unacceptable in principle and would be similar to other additions close to the property. However, the dormer could only be achieved by the harmful alteration of the rear roof and would therefore not be an acceptable form of development in this particular case for the reasons set out above.
10. The harm identified to the significance of the Conservation Area as a designated heritage asset would be less than substantial. In accordance with the Framework this harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The increased living accommodation would be a largely private benefit to the occupiers of the property. I saw nothing to indicate that the terrace roof needed regenerating. Given the scale of the development the benefits of increasing London's overall housing capacity, the efficient use of the site and the likely benefits to the local economy through the construction phase would be limited. These public benefits would not outweigh the great weight that I am required to give the designated heritage asset's conservation.
11. In conclusion, the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host property and the Camden Square Conservation Area, in conflict with Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 (Local Plan) which collectively seek to secure high quality design in development which preserves Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets. The proposal would conflict with the statutory test and the conserving and enhancing the historic environment policies of the Framework.

Conclusion and Recommendation

12. For the reasons outlined above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

A J Sutton

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

13. I have considered all the submitted evidence and concur that the appeal should be dismissed.

R C Kirby

INSPECTOR