



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2025

by **D Cramond** BSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3365627

2 Meadowbank, London NW3 3AY

- 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 Mike Tomshinsky against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Reference is 2024/5806/P.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension to include, rooflights and solar panels and a ground floor garage conversion and extension and refurbishment and alterations to the fenestration of the dwelling to include, removal of rear balcony, new and replacement windows and associated internal alterations.
-

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 property and the locality.

Reasons

Character and appearance

3. The appeal property forms part of a terrace of dwellings, one of two terraces, known as Meadowbank, and comprises a mid-terrace five storey house. The 1970s Meadowbank terraces were built as part of an estate in an architectural style of the period, in red brick with white render panels and detailing. The rear of the property backs onto Primrose Hill Road and has tree-filtered views over Primrose Hill Park. Meadowbank is a quiet secondary road with limited north south views along the curved frontage of the terrace. The area is of established residential character, and the appeal property and its neighbouring dwellings add positively to this and the pleasing appearance of the locality. The proposal is as described above.
 4. The Council's aesthetic concerns are based around cladding of the front brick pier in Corten steel, enlargement of front window openings at second and third floors and removal of the balcony at the rear.
 5. For my part I find that the use of Corten steel as planned would be acceptable. The repetition of the pillar and its division and shadowing would continue and the brown patinated surface would not be jarring on the eye when related to brickwork on the terrace. My sense is that it would visually register to only a slight degree for these reasons and the, often, foreground clutter of parked cars.
-

6. Unfortunately, I am less sanguine with regard to the front window openings. This higher-level complete regularity of the existing smaller openings is, to my mind, one of the defining rhythmic features of this terrace. I am in no doubt that the appeal scheme's enlarged width windows, even using the same vertical dimension, would look out of place and alien. Their insertion at this seemingly random positioned property in the terrace would look most ill-at-ease and impact upon the quality of the original architecture.
7. Similarly, I would assess that the rear balcony should be retained in its present form and position. The white rendered 'T' shaped embellishments may be the stand-out features on this elevation but the paired balconies also play an important part in the design integrity and interest of this long elevation. These dualled balconies are an interesting repeating geometric feature and I consider it would cause a negative visual impact to remove the structure from the appeal property. Full length first floor glazing has been approved under Council ref 2024/1459/P. Whilst two panels of this unusual height of first floor glazing being visible has been deemed acceptable, I would consider that a full four panels, atop the long panels at ground level, would appear 'over-glazed' and out of character with the building. Therefore, the removal of the balcony would, to my mind, also have the secondary impact of revealing an excessive extent of glazing.
8. I find it entirely understandable that the Appellant would wish to refresh and modernise the property but regrettably the scheme before me would not achieve this with sufficient degrees of sympathetic design or subtlety generally.
9. Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 is relevant. This policy seeks to secure high quality design, protect the character and appearance of buildings and their neighbourhood, to ensure harmonious development and the safeguarding of local distinctiveness. I conclude that the scheme would run contrary to this policy.

Other matters

10. I do understand the wish to undertake modernisation of the home, and I can see that careful consideration has been given to the selection of materials. I appreciate that the balcony, as an approved scheme now stands, and without further amendment, would become unusable, but that design consideration could have perhaps played a part in formulating the scheme approved under Council ref 2024/1459/P.
11. I noted other external alterations at Meadowbank which were drawn to my attention but through positioning, form or scale, found none in sum to be comparable to the case before me, which I must, in any event, assess on its own merits. Furthermore, I am not persuaded that a number of the changes should be used as a benchmark for good design. When the Appellant puts the case that alterations and loss of some original features have diminished the authenticity, and in parts the architectural quality and interest of the terrace, I would rather agree. However, in my opinion, this is one very good reason not to further erode this originally fully harmonious building.
12. I have carefully considered all the points raised by the Appellant, but these matters do not outweigh the concerns which I have in relation to the main issue identified above.

13. I confirm that policies in the National Planning Policy Framework have been considered; the Council's policy which I cite mirrors relevant objectives within the Framework.

Overall conclusion

14. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal proposal would have unacceptable adverse effects on the character or appearance of the host property and the locality. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

D Cramond

INSPECTOR