



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 June 2007

by **Jeremy Eagles** DipTP DMS 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

Date: 4 July 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/07/2033929

Flat 3, 25 Howitt Road, Belsize Park, London NW3 4LT

- 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 Edward Lees against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2006/1946/P, dated 25 April 2006, was refused by notice dated 30 June 2006.
- The development proposed is a dormer window and roof terrace.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Reasons

2. The appeal site comprises a sizable mid-terrace, 4-storey, property divided into self contained flats. It is located in the Belsize Park Conservation Area which in this part is characterised by substantial terraced dwellings of a scale and design which reflect their predominantly late Victorian/Edwardian age of construction. Like other dwellings in the terrace the appeal property features a double mansard roof with original dormer windows in both the front and rear planes of the lower, more steeply pitched roof element. The proposed dormer would be located in the upper section of the rear facing plane of the roof and would extend from just below the main ridgeline of the building to the top of the lower dormer window, the flat roof of which would be used as a terrace, enclosed by a stainless steel framed, glazed balustrade.
3. I accept that the net increase in the volume of the property arising from the proposal would be limited. However, the structure would occupy a significant proportion of the width of the roof and, with the full height glazing, would have a pronounced visual presence in the upper slope of the mansard giving it a top heavy appearance. Policy B3 of the *Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan* (UDP) states that permission will not be granted for alterations and extensions which cause harm to the architectural quality of the building or to the surrounding area. Despite the proposed balustrade being partially transparent and the presence of some intervening vegetation, when viewed from other neighbouring properties to the rear, the size and height of the proposal would not be subordinate to the present building and would appear as a bulky, dominant addition to the existing roof.
4. I saw several examples of other rear dormer extensions in the immediate locality which generally disrupted the continuity of the roofline of the terrace,

contrary to advice given in section 2.8 of *Supplementary Planning Guidance* and were not characteristic of the overall appearance of the area. I have noted the conclusions of the previous Inspector in dismissing an earlier appeal (APP/X5210/A/00/1055093) in relation to another proposal on the opposite side of Howitt Road. However, insufficient details of that case have been put before me to enable me to conclude that this provides a significant precedent. Nonetheless, having regard to UDP Policy B3 and Policy B7 which reflects the duty imposed by section 72(1) of the *Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990*, I consider that the proposal would cause harm to the architectural quality of the building and to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

5. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Jeremy Eagles

INSPECTOR