



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3374546

36 Grafton Terrace, Camden, London NW5 4HY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Frederic McCulloch against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2025/3798/P.
 - The development proposed is described as the installation of a roof terrace.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a 5-storey terraced house with the lowest storey partly below street level and the third floor partly within the roof space. It has a small rear garden and a terrace at upper ground floor level. It forms part of a handsome terrace and is similar in appearance to the houses to either side which appear to have formed a group of 6 largely identical houses when originally built. These houses retain a consistent parapet level at the front, which is a key contributor to the unity of the group. Notably the appeal property and 34 Grafton Terrace comprise an essentially identical mirrored pair both at the front and at the upper parts to the rear.
4. The neighbouring house, 38 Grafton Terrace, has a roof terrace. The glazed balustrades enclosing this space are clearly visible from Thurlow Terrace and are wholly incongruous features in the street scene. The railings above the rear elevation are a similarly alien feature. The Council advises that this roof terrace and the associated balustrades were created without planning permission and have subsequently become lawful. The information before me indicates that the next house along, No. 40, also has roof level external amenity space although this is less evident from street level. Further along the terrace roof extensions have been added which further disrupt the otherwise unified roofline.
5. The proposal would comprise the formation of a terrace covering the rear flat part of the roof of the appeal property. This would be bounded by metal railings to the

front and rear and the brick parapet wall at the rear would be raised to the same level as that at No. 38. Access to the roof terrace would be via a “skylight door” which the application drawings suggest would be flush with the terrace.

6. The metal balustrades at the front of the terrace would align with, and be similar in height to, the glass balustrades at No. 38. As a consequence of this they would be equally visible from Thurlow Terrace and would be similarly incongruous features in the street scene. The same would be the case at the rear, which I note is readily visible from both Malden Place and the terraced houses to the rear. The proposal would also have the effect of disrupting and causing material harm to the symmetrical arrangement of the appeal property and its mirrored pair, No.34.
7. For these reasons I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and the street scene. As such it is contrary to Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 which seeks to secure high quality design that respects local context and character.
8. The appellant has referred to an approved roof terrace at 117 Malden Road which is at the end of Grafton Terrace. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to its particular characteristics and context I attribute limited weight to this scheme.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR