



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 May 2025

by **Victor Callister BA(Hons) PGC(Oxon) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3364502

3 Lawford Road, Camden, London NW5 2LH

- 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 Ms Sarah Roeder against the decision of the London Borough of Camden Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0051/P.
 - The development proposed is a second storey rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a second storey rear extension at 3 Lawford Road, Camden, London NW5 2LH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2025/0051/P, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: PL-000, PL-008, PL-009, PL-010, PL-011, PL-012, PL-013 and PL-014,
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 4) Prior to installation details of the window in the development hereby permitted shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect on the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and that of the local area, with reference to the Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal dwelling is a 3 storey semi-detached house, with additional living space at loft level. It is located in a tree lined street made up of closely set and similarly scaled semi-detached properties and short terraces. These present cohesive frontages to the street and result in a high quality streetscape.

4. This part of Camden has been recognised as heritage asset through the designation of the CA by the Council. The Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area Statement (2027), (the CAS) clarifies its significance as a compact and well preserved Victorian residential development with a defined boundary and homogenous townscape and has changed little in over 150 years. The CAS defines it as a set piece of Victorian superior townscape planning. The CAS also notes the appeal dwelling as making a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the CA and, therefore, its significance as a heritage asset. In line with the duty imposed on me by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, I have given considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
5. The proposal is for a second storey extension that would sit on top of the existing two storey flat roofed outrigger at the rear of the appeal dwelling. The proposal would match the existing brick for the outrigger and its single rear window would replicate the design, scale and proportion of the appeal dwelling's existing fenestration. It would have a standing seam zinc roof in a hipped with crown roof form.
6. From my site visit it is evident that there are a significant number of similarly scaled second floor extensions on rear outriggers to other properties on this side of the street and the local area. Whilst the appeal dwelling appears substantially unaltered to the rear, the rear elevation is of no significant architectural merit. The CAS does however recognise the role that the rear elevations make to the significance of the CA, and that extensions should be unobtrusive and without adverse effect on the CA.
7. The proposal is if relatively modest in scale, reflecting that of the appeal dwelling. It generally follows the design of the existing outrigger, with the exception of its zinc roof. This is however a traditional roof form that would sit well below the roof of the main house, and although there does not appear to be zinc roofs over outriggers in the area, it would reflect the overall architectural expression of the appeal dwelling, arguably more successfully than a flat roof.
8. Overall, I find that the scale, design and materials of the proposal would result in it appearing as a secondary and subordinate addition to the appeal dwelling. Its proportions and scale would also not be so substantial that it would appear as an addition that would significantly visually unbalance the semi-detached pair of which it forms part. For these reasons I do not find that the proposal would represent an overbearing or obtrusive addition to the appeal dwelling.
9. Although there are views of the rear of the appeal dwelling and neighbouring properties from Patshull Road, within which the proposal would be visible, it would not be of a scale or prominence that it would have any significant effect on views of this part of the CA. Rather it would appear as a sympathetically designed addition to the appeal dwelling that would appear unobtrusively in the views from both the public realm and surrounding properties. As such the proposal would have no significant effect on the positive contribution that the appeal dwelling makes to the significance of the CA.

10. For the reasons given above, the proposal would not result in any significant harm to the character and appearance of the appeal dwelling and would preserve the character and appearance of the CA. As such, it would accord with Policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017), Policy DH1 and DH2 of the Hamstead Neighbourhood Plan (2018) and Policies D3 and HC1 of the London Plan (2021) and Sections 12 and 16 of the Framework. Collectively these seek to ensure that development is of high architectural and urban design quality, respects local context and preserves or enhances heritage assets.

Other Matters

11. Concerns have been raised by third parties with regard to loss privacy and outlook. Given the position, height, scale of the proposal and distances to neighbouring properties, I do not find that the bulk and massing of the proposal would be excessive or result in any significant loss of outlook. As the proposal would have a single rear window, I do not find that this would create any additional overlooking of neighbouring properties, over and above that available from the existing rear window to the appeal dwelling or other houses in the local area. As such I do not find that there would be any significant effect on the privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conditions

12. Along with the standard condition relating to the timing of implementation, I have attached conditions to ensure design quality that require compliance with the approved drawings, matching materials and the submission and approval of window details.

Victor Callister

INSPECTOR