



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 March 2025 by S Wilson LL.B. MSc MRTPI

Decision by M Russell BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/24/3357535

56 Howitt Road, Camden, London NW3 4LJ

- 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 Mr Amir Nooriala against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2024/4269/P.
 - The development proposed is dormer at loft level to rear elevation and additional skylight on the front elevation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the Belsize Park Conservation Area (BPCA).

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The significance of the BPCA largely derives from its mid-19th century Italianate villas and the high quality and consistency of its built environment. The appeal site is located within the 'Glenloch' sub-area, as defined in the BPCA Conservation Area Statement (published 2003) (CAS), identified as a distinct area of Edwardian terraced housing.
5. The CAS describes the houses on Howitt Road as 'two-storey red brick terraces with a basement and an attic storey within a slate-faced mansard. At roof level the party walls are expressed as upstands with shared chimneys located at the ridge that step up the street. The terraces are of similar design but show variations. All have three light, two storey bays and dormers and utilise render and white painted timber frames to provide contrast. The upper portions of windows are sub-divided by glazing bars, some with a decorative sunrise motif. The elevations give strong rhythm and consistency to the terrace except where this is interrupted by inappropriate alteration.'
6. To the side of the road where the appeal site is located, the characteristic attic storeys are mainly served by dormers to the lower sections of the distinctive mansard roof forms. Consequently, there is a strong rhythm and pattern to this

roofscape and the upper sections of the roofscape are largely unimpaired giving them an overriding uncluttered appearance. This consistency contributes positively to the character and appearance of the BPCA adding to its significance.

7. The proposal would mirror the existing dormer to the lower section of the mansard in terms of its size, materials, glazing pattern and design. However, it would introduce an uncharacteristic high-level dormer to the upper section of the mansard roof. This would unacceptably erode the overriding rhythm and consistency of the rear roofscape to this side of Howitt Road. As such, the proposal would be a harmful intrusion to the roof of this terrace and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the BPCA.
8. The appellant highlights a number of other properties on Howitt Road that have had rear dormers either built or approved to the upper sections of their respective roofscapes. With the exception of 58 Howitt Road (No 58), all of the examples referred to by the appellant relate to rear elevations on the opposite side of Howitt Road and are not seen alongside the rear of the appeal terrace which retains an overriding uniformity at upper roof level.
9. The dormer at 58 Howitt Road (No 58) was granted permission at appeal in 1986, and the evidence suggests the dormers at 32 and 34 Howitt Road further along this terrace were also approved in the 1980's, all notably before the adoption of the current development plan and the publication of the CAS. In any case, these limited examples of additions to the upper section of the mansard roofscape are not reflective of the wider roofscape on this terrace.
10. Furthermore, the appeal at No 58 partly turned on the fact that views of the proposal were limited, particularly as 60 and 62 Howitt Road turn the corner and close off most of any possible view from the street. That is in contrast to the rear elevation of the appeal property which is more discernible from the street where Howitt Road meets Glenilla Road. The proposal would also appear incongruous seen from other properties in the immediate vicinity and within the BPCA.
11. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas. Given the scale and location of the proposed development, the harm to the significance of the BPCA would be less than substantial in terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). Nevertheless, I must attach great weight to this harm in accordance with the Framework. I am required to balance this harm against the public benefits of the proposal.
12. The appeal property appears to already be a viable and substantial residential dwellinghouse. There is no compelling evidence that the proposal is required to enable this to continue and there are no identifiable public benefits put forward. Therefore, the public benefits would not outweigh the less than substantial harm to the character or appearance of the BPCA.
13. Accordingly, the proposal would conflict with Policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017) which seek high quality design that respects local character and preserves or enhances conservation areas. For the reasons set out, the proposal would also conflict with the heritage conservation requirements in the Framework.

Other Matters

14. I acknowledge that there is support from a local resident. However, this does not justify the harm identified under the main issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

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

S Wilson

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

16. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

M Russell

INSPECTOR