



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2018

by **C L Humphrey BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2018

---

### Appeal Ref: **APP/X5210/W/18/3195892**

### Flat A 38 Iverson Road, London NW6 2HE

- 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 Ciaran Whelan against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2017/6503/P, dated 21 November 2017, was refused by notice dated 18 January 2018.
  - The development proposed is a ground floor rear extension.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the appeal proposal upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area.

### Reasons

3. The neighbouring properties at 36 and 40 Iverson Road have sizeable rear additions on the boundary with the appeal site. However, in keeping with the established pattern of closet wings along the terrace, they do not occupy the whole rear elevation. The proposed extension would span the full width of the plot and project around 9m from the rear elevation, extending more than 2m beyond the rear addition at No 40. In combination with the existing closet wing, the proposal would almost double the footprint of the appeal property. The extension would be constructed in matching bricks and the tall rectangular French doors on the rear elevation would reflect the proportions of the existing fenestration. However, by virtue of its width, depth and mass, the appeal proposal would create a disproportionately large addition which would fail to respect the character and proportions of the existing building and the prevailing pattern and scale of surrounding development.
4. Nearby, 44 Iverson Road features a single storey full-width rear extension. However, the submitted details indicate that its mass is broken up by an internal courtyard. Consequently, this scheme does not appear to be directly comparable to the appeal proposal. The appellant has referred to a recent planning permission for a 2 storey extension at 136B Iverson Road. I have not been provided with full details of this other scheme and therefore cannot draw comparisons with the proposed development. In any event, I must determine the appeal on its own merits and have done so.

5. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have a harmful effect upon the character and appearance of the host property and surrounding area, contrary to Policy D1 Design of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan and Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

### **Other Matters**

6. The Council has not objected to the scheme in relation to the effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and, based on the evidence before me, I see no reason to take a different view. Nevertheless, an absence of harm in respect of this matter is a neutral factor which does not weigh for or against the proposal.

### **Conclusion**

7. For the foregoing reasons and having had regard to all other matters raised I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*CL Humphrey*

INSPECTOR