



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 November 2011

by Joanna Reid BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) RIBA

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

Decision date: 15 November 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/11/2154891

Flat 3, 37 Platts Lane, London NW3 7NN

- 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 and Mrs F Nosrati against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2011/0162/P, dated 21 January 2011, was refused by notice dated 30 March 2011.
 - The development proposed is "to install a glass balustrade onto an existing first floor terrace".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Redington & Frognal Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Redington & Frognal Conservation Area is largely characterised by late nineteenth-century and Edwardian mainly residential suburban development, in a range of architectural styles, set in verdant surroundings. The appeal building is identified as one which makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area in the Council's *Redington/Frognal Conservation Area Statement*. I agree. The adjoining building at 39 Platts Lane, which includes a substantial rear extension, is not so identified. I also agree.
4. The back of the appeal building includes an upper ground floor rear conservatory with obscure-glazed sides, which is sited on a deeper and wider flat-roofed lower ground floor extension. Whilst the conservatory is not particularly characteristic of the Conservation Area, due to its hipped-roofed form, and its limited depth and width, much of the upper part of the original appeal building and the neighbouring buildings can still be appreciated.
5. The proposed balustrade would be in keeping with the materials of the conservatory. However, it would have a modern appearance which would contrast starkly with the traditional materials and detailing of the original building and others in the wider Conservation Area. Due to its prominent elevated siting, the solid appearance of its opaque glazing, its height, its depth and width, and its inharmonious design, the balcony would be a bulky and

incongruous addition which would harm the character and appearance of the appeal building. It would be harmfully intrusive in views from the surrounding dwellings and gardens, and from the street in Briardale Gardens.

6. An extension has been permitted at 35 Platts Lane, but that building is a single dwelling house, so its planning circumstances differ from the flat in this appeal. Other balustrades and roof terraces near the appeal site were drawn to my attention. However, I have little information about them, so they are not very helpful to me in this appeal, which I have dealt with in accordance with its site specific circumstances and relevant national and Development Plan policy. I have taken account of the points in favour raised by the appellant, including the support of some local residents, but they do not outweigh the planning considerations which have led to my conclusion.
7. I consider that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal building, and, in consequence, it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. It would be contrary to Policy CS14 of the *Camden Core Strategy 2010* and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the *Camden Development Policies 2010*, which seek a high standard of design and to conserve Camden's heritage.
8. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeal fails.

Joanna Reid

INSPECTOR