



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 24 July 2007

by **David Nicholson** RIBA IHBC

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Date: 31 July 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/E/07/2041718

26 Greville Rd., London NW6 5JA

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Mr B Pulsford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref. 206/4253/L, dated 10 September 2006, was refused by notice dated 13 April 2007.
- The works proposed are the installation of roof mounted solar panels to the rear of the building and a replacement rooflight.

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/07/2041719

26 Greville Rd., London NW6 5JA

- 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 B Pulsford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref. 2006/4245/P, dated 14 September 2006, was refused by notice dated 22 January 2007.
- The development proposed is the installation of roof mounted solar panels to the rear of the building and a replacement rooflight.

Decisions

1. I allow the appeals, and grant listed building consent and planning permission for the installation of roof mounted solar panels to the rear of the building and a replacement rooflight at 26 Greville Rd., London in accordance with the terms of the applications, Refs. 206/4253/L and 2006/4245/P, dated 10 and 14 September 2006, and drawings nos. 001 and 002 submitted with them, each subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The works/development hereby authorised/permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this consent/decision.

Procedural Matter

2. There is some discrepancy between the drawings referred to as accompanying the application, which are before me, and those referred to the Council's Decision Notices. I have reached my Decisions on the basis of the drawings to the applications and appeals as listed above.
-

Reasons

3. St John's Wood conservation area is characterised by two small enclaves of historic buildings. No.26 Greville Road is one half of a Regency house and is listed at Grade II. The main roof has shallow hips and is slate covered. An adjoining two storey studio has a mansard roof with a flat-roofed link. The proposed solar panels would sit on top of the rear slope of the main roof and both sections of the rear slope of the mansard to the studio.
4. In my opinion the slated roof slopes are an essential part of the special interest of the listed building which in turn contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Although the front slopes are more important to the public realm, those to rear also make a contribution although they are barely discernible from other public viewpoints. While the degree of harm would be limited, the proposals would alter the finish to a key feature of the house and so detract from both the listed building and the conservation area. They would therefore be contrary to advice in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 (PPG15): *Planning and the Historic Environment* to preserve listed buildings and to policies B6 and B7 of the Camden Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and the Camden Design Guide, which echo the advice in PPG15.
5. On the other hand, the Council has advised that it encourages energy efficiency and sustainable forms of energy, that the aspiration to contribute towards a reduction in global warming is admirable, and that it would be supported in the right context. I agree. Consequently the appeal is supported by UDP Policy SD9, which encourages renewable energy, and by advice in PPG22: *Renewable Energy*, which gives weight to the benefits of renewable energy. Given that I have found the quantum of harm to the listed building would be small, and that to the conservation area would be negligible, I have struck a different balance. I find that the benefits towards reduced global warming, which are in turn likely to help towards preserving the environment, including the listed building, would outweigh the harm to it, and so the appeals should be allowed.
6. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that both appeals should succeed.

David Nicholson

INSPECTOR