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| --- | --- |
| Reason(s) for Refusal 1  | The proposed roof extension, by reason of its bulk, height and location, on a terrace of unimpaired rooflines, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, street scene and Harmood Street Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.  |

I wish to appeal the decision of Camden Council on the following grounds:

1. The Planning Officer states that 63 Harmood Street sits on a terrace of unimpaired roof lines. Number 59 Harmood Street used to be a public house, now converted into flats, and is three storeys. Numbers 61 & 63 are two storeys. Number 65 is also three storey and so the planning officers’ statement is simply incorrect. The original buildings on 61 & 63 Harmood Street were shops, which suffered bomb damage during the war and were rebuilt as homes. It is acknowledged by the Planning Officer that they do not enjoy the elaborate architectural detailing as do other properties in the street. There are no stucco surrounds to the windows and door and no arched window head as can be seen in other properties and is referred to in the Conservation Guide. My submission is that the officer should have looked at 63 Harmood street more narrowly in the context of the taller buildings on either side and not in the context of the longer terrace. This point can be clearly seen from Google Streetview.
2. If you look at the Conservation Area Statement, CB27, it acknowledges that it will be necessary to assess proposals on an individual basis and taking into account the adjoining properties. I do not feel that the Planning Officer has given enough weight to this. Almost opposite 63 Harmood Street is Powlett Place, where there are similar mansards in place as to the one proposed for 63 Harmood Street and they can also be seen on Harmood House (next door to 59 Harmood Street). Harmood House has been excluded from the Conservation Area and is five storeys high with a mansard roof.
3. The Planning Officer relies on Policy D1 and D2 from the Local Plan. Policy D1 relates to high quality design and the proposed design for 63 Harmood Street is high quality. The Planning Officer states in her report that the detailed design and use of materials of the mansard is typically considered appropriate. Policy D2 relates to heritage. This is also picked up in the Conservation Document for Harmood Street. The policy clearly states that weight should be given to the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings. It also should give weight to the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development. I do not feel that the officer has sufficient weight to the scale and form of neighbouring buildings as it is my contention that 63 Harmood Street is subservient to its neighbouring properties and that the mansard would not be detrimental to the street scene.
4. Looking at the NPPF, Chapter 16, Paragraphs 189-202, in particular Paragraph 196 where it states “where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum, viable use”. My submission is that this development will lead to less than substantial harm to the Conservation area but will secure property as a family home. In the Planning Officer’s report Paragraph 3.4 “as such, the proposal is considered to bring about harm to the character and appearance of the Harmood Street Conservation area, albeit **less than substantial**.

Therefore for all the above reasons I wish to appeal against the planning decision of Camden Council with regards to 63 Harmood Street.