



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 October 2021

by Diane Cragg DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 02 November 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/21/3271148 29 Powlett Place, London NW1 8DR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr John Grabowski against the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application ref 2020/5467/P is dated 23 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is 'remove the existing outhouse to the building while lowering and extending the property to the rear, full-width at ground level and part width at first floor level with general internal refurbishment throughout the existing house and external landscaping upgrades to the rear and front gardens including reinstatement of the traditional front boundary'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted to remove the existing outhouse to the building while lowering and extending the property to the rear, full-width at ground level and part width at first floor level with general internal refurbishment throughout the existing house and external landscaping upgrades to the rear and front gardens including reinstatement of the traditional front boundary at 29 Powlett Place, London NW1 8DR in accordance with the terms of the application ref 2020/5467/P dated 23 November 2020 subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and statement: 027-MK-E1201, 027-MK-E1202, 027-MK-E1203, 027-MK-E1401, 027-MK-E1603, 027-MK-E1602 Rev A, 027-MK-E1601 Rev A, 027-MK-E0101 Rev A, 027-MK-P1201, 027-MK-P1202, 027-MK-P1203, 027-MKP1401, 027-MK-P1603, 027-MK-P1602 Rev A, 027-MK-P1601 Rev A, 027-MKP0101; Arboriculturists statement dated 20 November 2020.
 - 3) 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.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of development on the appeal form is different to that on the application form. There is no indication that the amended description has been

agreed therefore I have determined the appeal based on the description of the development originally applied for.

3. During the course of the appeal, the revised National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on 20 July 2021 and The London Plan, March 2021 has been adopted. Both parties have had the opportunity to comment on the relevance of these documents to their case and no party would be prejudiced by my taking them into account.
4. The Council did not determine the application within the prescribed time period. However, an officer report sets out the reasons why the Council considers the proposal to be unacceptable. I have had regard to this and other parties' submissions in determining the main issues set out below.
5. The appeal site is within the Harmood Street Conservation Area (HSCA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.

Main Issue

6. Having regard to the above, the main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the HSCA.

Reasons

7. To its eastern side, Powlett Place is an attractive residential pedestrian width street where most dwellings are similar designed terraced house set back behind enclosed and landscaped front gardens. No 29 Powlett Place is a two-storey mid terraced house and in common with many within the HSCA incorporates a low roof parapet to the street which hides a traditional butterfly roof profile. No 29 has a rear single storey flat roofed outrigger providing a bathroom, but has otherwise not been extended.
8. The HSCA derives its overall significance from the area's development between 1840 and 1870, a relatively short period. Dwellings are well detailed terraced houses over two storeys that remain largely unaltered with a distinct cottage character. The Harmood Street Conservation Area Statement (HSCA Statement) identifies that most of the buildings make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the HSCA.
9. There are various two storey extensions to the properties along Harmood Street and a number within Powlett Place that are visible from rear gardens of adjacent properties but have limited visibility in the street scene. The HSCA Statement acknowledges that there is pressure for extensions to existing buildings. Where these are positioned to the rear there is little or no impact on the HSCA as the gardens are relatively private and screened from public viewpoints. Roof alterations are more likely to affect the character of the HSCA.
10. The depth of the ground floor addition is greater than the extensions to either side. However, there are examples of similar rear projections at ground floor within the row and extensions that take up the width of the plot. The proposal sits in a generous rear garden and the height, depth and width of the proposed ground floor addition would not be a prominent feature of the terraced row, nor would it detract from the contribution the property makes to the HSCA.

11. The first-floor addition would be of a similar depth to the neighbouring extension, would be compatible in its detailed design and would not disrupt the butterfly roof form of the main house. Whilst the first floor would be visible from the rear of existing properties, and there would be some limited visibility of it from Castle Mews, its size and scale would not appear out of character with its neighbours. I accept that within the short terrace there are limited other first-floor rear extensions, but other first floor additions to properties facing Harmood Street are visible as part of the overall rear garden environment and the first floor addition would not appear incongruous in its context. Consequently, the proposal can be accommodated without detracting from the significance of the HSCA even when attaching great weight to the asset's conservation and when having regard to the duty under the Act.
12. While there would be a small loss of historic fabric at the rear, there is little substantive evidence to demonstrate the rear wall of this unlisted buildings is a characteristic feature that contributes to the significance of the HSCA. In any case, taking into account the small scale of the loss, the impact would be minor and localised so as to be neutral in the context of the HSCA as a whole.
13. Overall, I conclude that the development would preserve the character and appearance of the HSCA and would accord with Policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 which requires development to respect local context and character and ensure development in the conservation area preserves and where possible enhances the character or appearance of the area. It would also comply with the Camden Planning Guidance 'Design' January 2021 where it seeks to ensure that the scale of development integrates well with the surrounding area and positively integrates with and enhances character and history.

Other Matters

14. The Council is satisfied that the development can be accommodated without detriment to the living conditions of neighbouring properties and without impacting on the tree in the neighbouring garden, subject to its protection during the construction of the extension. The details of the proposed front boundary wall and bin and cycle store are considered acceptable, and the proposed wall would be a positive feature, reinstating a detail that is characteristic of the HSCA. Following my site visit I see no reason to disagree on these matters.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have attached a plans condition as this provides certainty and a materials conditions to ensure that the extension has a satisfactory appearance in the HSCA.
16. The arboriculturists report sets out a method to protect the tree in the neighbour's rear garden and the plans condition requires the development to be carried out in accordance with those details. A separate condition is therefore not required.

Conclusion

17. I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the HSCA and would accord with the development plan, the Framework, and

the duty under the Act, therefore, the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted subject to conditions.

Diane Cragg

INSPECTOR