



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 February 2018

by **Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

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

Decision date: 5 March 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3192469

24 Harley Road, London NW3 3BN

- 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 David Glick against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2017/3532/P, dated 19 June 2017, was refused by notice dated 10 October 2017.
 - The development proposed is a single storey extension and use of flat roof as a terrace with timber screen and planters to the flank elevation at first floor level.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey extension and use of flat roof as a terrace with timber screen and planters to the flank elevation at first floor level at 24 Harley Road, London NW3 3BN in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2017/3532, dated 19 June 2017, 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, all prefix, 214: A001; A002; A003; A004; A005; A005 third floor plan; A020; A02; A022; A023; A023 NW existing; A101 R1; A102 R1; A120; A121; A122; A130 DAS 01.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this 3 storey, plus basement, semi-detached house which is located within the Elsworthy Conservation Area. The house forms part of an attractive pair of Victorian dwellings which make a positive contribution to the conservation area.

4. An addition to the side has been constructed which provides accommodation at basement and ground floor level. A terrace with screening has been formed on the flat roof of this addition and this has been the subject of a recently issued Certificate of Lawfulness (Ref 2017/6911/P). This has resulted in screening being provided around the perimeter of the terrace to its sides and set back from the front of the building.
5. The proposal would provide an extension in place of the terrace, with a small area of terracing to the front, set back from the front of the building. When compared to the screening to the terrace that is the subject of the Certificate of Lawfulness, the proposal would be taller and would be set back further from the front of the building. Its front elevation would be at an angle and of glazing. Taking account of the set-back and its materials, I consider that the front elevation and the proposed screening to the terrace, would have less effect on the street views than the development which is the subject of the Certificate of Lawfulness. It would be set well back from the front of the building, much lower than the host building and set back from the frontage of the modern and large extension to the adjacent property at No 26. In this respect, even though the proposal would be marginally taller than the extension to No 26, it would not have any dominating effect due to the relative sizes and positions of the buildings. Therefore, within the street views, the proposal would have an acceptable effect and would not negatively affect the character or appearance of the conservation area.
6. In relation to the design and materials, other modern extensions exist within the area, including the adjacent one referred to above. Modern designs can often sit harmoniously with more traditional buildings and in this instance I consider that the proposal would sit comfortably within its position. The materials would reflect other elements found within the area, although expressed here in a modern form. Taking account of these matters and the Lawful Development Certificate, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area and there is no inconsistency with the Council's policies, including Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan.
7. In relation to conditions, I agree with those suggested by the Council; the agreement of materials is necessary so that the effects of the development are acceptable and implementation in accordance with the approved plans is necessary for the sake of certainty.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR