



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 April 2009

by **PG Lloyd BA(Hons) MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Decision date:  
10 June 2009**

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/09/2093835**

**8 Howitt Road, London, NW3 4LL**

- 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 R McGregor, RGM Properties Ltd against the decision of the London Borough of Camden Council.
- The application Ref 2008/3484/P, dated 2 July 2008, was refused by notice dated 26 August 2008.
- The development proposed is the conversion of existing loft space, addition of new dormer window and rooflight to the rear of the building.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the building and the Belsize Park Conservation Area.

## Reasons

3. The proposed development relates to the upper part of a dual-angled mansard roof in a mid-terraced Edwardian building in the Belsize Park Conservation Area. Largely unimpaired by roof alterations, this is one of many buildings in Howitt Road of similar style with original dormers contained within the lower, steeper plane of the roofs at both the front and rear.
4. The development plan is the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan adopted 2006 (UDP). Its relevant objectives are to encourage good design through Policy B1; to protect the architectural quality of a building or surrounding area having regard to the form, proportion and character of the building, its setting and whether development is subordinate to it under Policy B3, whilst Policy B7 only permits development in a conservation area where it preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the conservation area.
5. The Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement (adopted 2003) identifies the appeal premises as lying within in group of buildings that make a positive contribution to the conservation area as good examples of local building tradition. The development plan policies identified are supplemented by the Camden Planning Guidance, adopted 2006 (SPG) which seeks to protect the appearance of a building and the surrounding area by restricting roof

- extensions where a terrace or group of buildings is largely unimpaired by extension or alteration.
6. Converting the loft area to living accommodation is consistent with national objectives of making efficient use of land whilst inserting rooflights as shown would not harm the character or appearance of the building or conservation area.
  7. However, the proposed dormer would be visible from the rear of properties on Glenmore Road and because of its size and position in the upper roof slope it would appear incongruous and visually imposing. It would project outward beyond the chimney on the common boundary between Nos 6 and 8 Howitt Road, increasing its visual dominance in the uppermost part of the roof and it would be in my view a discordant element within the largely unaltered roofscape. I conclude as a result that the proposed development would harm the architectural integrity of the building and the wider group of buildings contrary to the objectives of UDP Policies B1 and B3 and that it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area contrary to the objectives of UDP Policy B7.
  8. Whilst the proposed development would not be visible directly from the public realm and it would be smaller than development subject of a dismissed appeal at 44 Howitt Road to which my attention has been drawn, this is not sufficient mitigation to address the specific harm that I have identified. My attention has been drawn to other roof extensions which, it is argued, justify allowing this appeal. I note that in most cases they gained permission prior to adoption of the current UDP, the SPD and Conservation Area Statement. In relation to the proposal at No 41 Howitt Road permitted in 2007, the dormer window would be set within the plane of the roof slope behind a roof terrace. I therefore give little weight to them as examples of precedent.
  9. I have had regard to all other matters raised but none outweigh my conclusions in respect of the harm caused. I therefore dismiss the appeal.

*P G Lloyd*

INSPECTOR