



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 September 2025

by N Unwin BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/25/3368503

5 Albert Terrace, Camden, London NW1 7SU

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by condition of a planning application.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Lawrence Salem against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2024/1359/P sought approval of details pursuant to conditions Nos 4, 5, and 6 of planning permission Ref 2021/6185/P granted on 14 March 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as: external alterations including alterations to lower ground floor rear facade, new fenestration, replacement third floor balustrade, expanded front lightwell, skylights, partial lowering of garden, hard landscaping and associated alterations.
 - Condition 4: Before the relevant part of the work is begun, detailed drawings, or samples of materials as appropriate, in respect of the following, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
 - a) Details including sections at 1:10 of all windows including frames, glazing bars, jambs, head and cills. The relevant part of the works shall be carried out in accordance with the details thus approved and any approved samples shall be retained on site during the course of the works.Reason for Condition 4: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and condition 4 of application 2024/1359/P, is discharged. The relevant drawings submitted and approved in relation to condition 4 of consent 2021/6185/P are:
 - 31_01_P – Typical window detail Sash window

Preliminary Matter

2. I note that the windows have recently been replaced, but for the avoidance of doubt, I am dealing with the appeal proposal before me.

Main Issue

3. The Council granted approval for the discharge of conditions 5 (tree protection) and 6 (hard and soft landscaping). However, this appeal follows the refusal by the Council to approve details required by condition 4 with particular regard to window details.
4. Therefore, the main issue is whether the details submitted are sufficient and acceptable to discharge condition 4, having regard to the condition itself and the reason for imposing the condition.

Reasons

5. The site is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area (the CA) wherein I have a statutory duty under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area.
6. The Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (CAS) describes the significance and character of the CA as being derived from its residential character formed of well laid out Victorian terraces. The area within which the site is located contains Italianate villas designed to appear as grand residential properties.
7. Dominant features of these villa properties include timber sliding sash windows with such original detailing adding to the visual interest of properties. The site comprises a large semi-detached villa property with timber sliding sash windows with the CAS identifies 1 – 6 Albert Terrace, including the appeal property, as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
8. The CAS states that where original architectural features have been removed, replacement with suitable copies will be encouraged. The Home Improvements Camden Planning Guidance (2021) (CPG) states that certain elements of the window such as structural glazing bars are to be retained, but glazing could be changed from single to double glazing.
9. The proposed double glazed windows would match the material, colour, frame, opening mechanism and glazing bar proportions of the existing windows for this type of villa, with the only difference being the glazing bars would be applied rather than integral. Spacer bars would be utilised between the glazing bars so that from the public realm the glazing bars would appear integral. As such, with the exception of the change from single to double glazing, the proposed windows would be virtually indistinguishable from the existing, having a neutral impact on and preserving their contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
10. Whilst the CPG states that stuck on glazing bars easily deteriorate, I have not been provided with any evidence of this nor any reason to doubt the quality of the proposed glazing bars.
11. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed windows would preserve the character and appearance of the CA and that the details submitted in respect of the window details, would meet the requirements of condition 4 and the reasons for it. As such, I find no conflict with the relevant provisions of Policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017). When read together these policies require development within conservation areas preserves the character or appearance of the area in addition to being of a high quality design.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons set out above, the appeal is allowed for the discharge of condition 4.

N Unwin

INSPECTOR