



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 February 2019

by Ian McHugh Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 March 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/18/3218538

16 Eton Road, London, NW3 4SS

- 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 Mrs Diane Culligan against the decision of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2018/1613/P, dated 3 April 2018, was refused by notice dated 24 September 2018.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a two storey side/rear infill extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Eton Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal property is semi-detached, four storey Victorian dwelling (plus a mezzanine floor in the roof-space), which is situated in a prominent position on the corner of Eton Road and Fellows Road. The property is within (albeit on the edge of) the CA. The built development in the CA is mixed in character, with varying ages, styles and size of buildings. However, one of the significant characteristics of the CA is the large Victorian dwellings, many of which have retained their distinctive architectural features. This includes the appeal property. In addition, the Council states that the appeal property is part of a group of buildings that make a positive contribution to the CA. In my opinion, this increases the significance and importance of the property.
4. The proposal is to erect a two storey side/rear extension. It would infill an existing space at the rear of an earlier four storey extension and at the side of the original dwelling. The existing four storey extension has been designed in a traditional form, to match the style of the original dwelling. The proposed extension would be different in appearance, because of its contemporary design. Consequently, it would contrast sharply with both the original building and the four storey extension.
5. Policies D1 and D2 of the adopted Camden Local Plan 2017 seek (amongst other things) to secure high quality design that respects local character and context; and to preserve, or where possible, enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. These policies are consistent with the

provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (the Framework), which contains similar provisions.

6. The appellant states that the proposed extension would provide accommodation that would “allow the building to open up and adapt to modern family life”. She points out that the extension would be small scale and would appear as a new stage in the building’s evolution, rather than appearing as a ‘pastiche’.
7. My attention has also been drawn to a number of other extensions and examples of built development that contrast with the traditional building style found within the CA and its surroundings. These include contemporary glazed additions, roof extensions and new buildings. The appellant considers that they are now an established part of the character of the CA. I viewed some of these examples at my site visit and they are a material consideration in making my decision. However, I am required to deal with the appeal proposal on its own merits.
8. Notwithstanding the appellant’s approach to the design of the extension and the fact that the proposed glazed sections would provide some visual separation between the old and the new, I consider that the development would appear as an incongruous and unsympathetic addition that would fail to integrate with the existing property. The position of the extension in a prominent corner location would mean that the proposal would be highly visible and it would detract from the character and appearance of both the appeal property and the streetscene because of its overall form and somewhat boxy appearance. Accordingly, the proposal would fail to either preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the CA.
9. I note that the Council’s Conservation Area Advisory Committee objected to the proposal because of its scale and the loss of garden space. However, I consider that the reduction in garden would not be significant, due to the relatively small footprint of the extension and the enclosed nature of the space.
10. In the context of paragraph 196 of the Framework, I consider there would be harm to the heritage asset, but the harm would be less than substantial. Consequently, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst the extension would provide additional accommodation within the dwelling, I am not persuaded that this would be a public benefit that would weigh in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the CA and it would conflict with the provisions of both the Development Plan and the Framework, as referred to above. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

Ian McHugh

INSPECTOR