



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 March 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 April 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3360359

30 Chalcot Road, Camden London NW1 8LN

- 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 Mr Kerem Cevahir against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2024/4195/P.
 - The development proposed is the erection of first floor rear infill extension and associated works.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property forms one end of a handsome Victorian terrace of 4-storey houses that make a clear and substantial positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. At the time of my visit the lower and upper ground floor rear additions granted planning permission in 2024¹ were at an advanced stage of construction.
4. The property is abutted by 12, 13 and 14 Chalcot Gardens, a grade II listed terrace featuring ornate Stucco frontages. This terrace is set back further from the pavement than the appeal property and consequently the rear elevations of the listed group protrude some distance beyond the main rear elevation of the appeal property.
5. The part of the CA within which the appeal property is situated is dominated by long terraces of mid-19th century houses that are laid out in a grid pattern and set back from the pavement with small lightwells and railings to basement areas, although there are some earlier and later buildings within the area. The appeal site's surroundings display a high degree of uniformity which is a key constituent of the character and appearance of the CA and a matter to which I attach significant weight.

¹ Application reference: 2014/0035/P

6. The terrace of which the appeal property forms part includes a variety of lower and upper ground floor rear extensions which to varying degrees disrupt the unity of the group. In addition, a few properties in the terrace, including the appeal property, feature rear additions above upper ground floor level. These elements are anomalies in the wider area to the rear of the appeal site which is generally notable for the retention of the original configuration of the upper parts of the rear elevations.
7. The proposal would comprise the erection of a first floor rear addition in the gap between the landing level closet wing of the house and the flank elevation of 12 Chalcot Gardens. The elevation of this addition would line through with that of the closet wing whilst the roof level would be about 1.2m above the level of the closet wing's roof. I note that this would be of a high quality of design and use appropriate materials and fenestration. However, in this context the proposal would, due to its elevated position, be an overly prominent and incongruous addition that would unacceptably disrupt the prevailing appearance of rear elevations in the area.
8. I therefore conclude that due to its siting and size the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. The harm to this heritage asset would be less than substantial. In these circumstances Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework) requires me to weigh the harm against the public benefits of the proposal. As the proposal simply provides extra private space for the occupiers of the appeal property there would be no public benefits arising from it.
9. As each planning application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits having regard to its particular context and current development plan policy, I attribute limited weight to the various planning permissions for rear additions granted planning permission over the last 25 years referred to by the appellant, some of which illustrate the harm that can occur where such development is carried out.
10. In conclusion, for the reasons set out above the proposal is contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development respects local context and preserves or enhances heritage assets. The proposal is also contrary to the aims of the Framework.

Conclusion

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

S Poole

INSPECTOR