

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2016

**by Les Greenwood MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 14 January 2016**

---

## **Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/15/3135745**

### **17 Edis Street, London NW1 8LE**

- 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 Stefan Isaacs against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2015/2469/P was refused by notice dated 30 July 2015.
  - The development proposed is a new rear single storey extension, alterations to the fenestration on the rear elevation including removal of 1 double height window and the installation of another.
- 

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Procedural matter**

2. The proposal originally included replacement of the existing metal balustrade to the existing first floor terrace with a brick upstand. Amended plans were submitted during the application process, deleting this part of the proposal. I have determined the appeal on that basis.

### **Main issue**

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

### **Reasons**

4. This part of the conservation area is characterised by regularly laid out streets lined by terraces of handsome, well-crafted mid to late Victorian 3+ storey houses. The Council's *Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement* describes Edis Street as a secondary road with a distinctly urban character and a high degree of enclosure. It lists Nos 1-31 Edis Street amongst the buildings which are particularly good examples of the local building tradition, making a positive contribution to the conservation area.
  5. 17 Edis Street is a terraced house with a small courtyard back garden at lower ground floor level plus a rear wing extending up to the first floor. I understand that there is an existing permission to infill more of the garden with a lower ground floor only extension stretching the full width of the plot. The appeal
-

- proposal would provide a similar size of extension, turned 90 degrees to run from the house to the back boundary, again at lower ground floor level.
6. The proposed flat roofed extension would fit well within the admittedly limited space, in character with other extensions nearby. It would be a distinct element, clearly a modern extension, and would be so low that it would be little seen by anyone. In this context, its modern design and glazed side wall would complement the building.
  7. The proposal also includes the replacement of a rear sash window and a more recent pair of doors at ground floor and lower ground floor level with a much larger, 2 storey height, almost undivided glazed panel. The scale and design of this glazing would conflict significantly with the more finely detailed craftsmanship of the original building. I have taken note of the other examples of contemporary design for rear alterations brought to my attention by the appellant. These all, it appears to me, take a more nuanced approach to the juxtaposition of modern and traditional design elements. I have also noted an appeal decision relating to a house elsewhere in London<sup>1</sup> which again relates to a different proposal in a different situation. I have considered this proposal on its merits, finding that the proposed glazing would not be sympathetic to the character or architecture of the building.
  8. I conclude that, for this reason only, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area. It therefore conflicts with the aims of Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 Policy CS14 and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025, to ensure that development is of a high standard of design that respects local context and preserves or enhances Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets. The proposal would also fail to follow the guidance set out in Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design, that original (or original-style) windows should be replaced like for like wherever possible in order to preserve the character of the property.
  9. I have taken into account all other matters raised, including the concerns expressed by neighbours and others. In particular, I find that the proposed extension would be so low in height and so modest in scale that it would not have a significant effect on living conditions at any neighbouring property. The proposed glazing would furthermore have little impact on neighbours' privacy, as similar views are already available.
  10. Although I have found in favour of the proposal in some respects, my objection in regard to the proposed glazing is sufficiently compelling for me to conclude that the appeal should not succeed.

*Les Greenwood*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>1</sup> APP/X5990/D/13/2208307