



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 July 2025

by **M Cryan BA(Hons) DipTP MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/25/3364445

30C Glenhurst Avenue, London NW5 1PS

- 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 Louisa Webster against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application reference is 2024/1690/P.
- The development proposed is the installation of new doors and windows to an existing dormer to create a balcony.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the installation of new doors and windows to an existing dormer to create a balcony at 30C Glenhurst Avenue, London NW5 1PS in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 2024/1690/P, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with following approved plan: "As proposed" drawing no 299/P2 Rev A dated March 2024.
 - 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match as closely as possible in colour and texture those of the existing building, unless otherwise specified in the approved application.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to a flat on the top floor of a three-storey terrace property on the northern side of Glenhurst Avenue. There are two separate box dormers at the rear of the flat, one serving the bedroom, the other serving the bathroom. The proposed development is the replacement of the window in the bedroom dormer with timber-framed French doors, and the creation of a small balcony area to be enclosed by painted steel railings.
4. The site is within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area ("the DPCA"), and I have a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, the National Planning Policy Framework ("the Framework") states that they should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their

significance (paragraph 202). It goes on to advise that any harm or loss requires clear and convincing justification (paragraph 213) and that any harm that is less than substantial must be weighed against the public benefit of the proposal (paragraph 215).

5. The DPCA covers a large, primarily residential area, though with other uses (including community buildings such as schools and churches, and workshops and offices) interspersed throughout. The 2009 DPCA Appraisal and Management Statement ("the AMS") describes the area as having a variety and complexity that charts the history of domestic architecture from the late 18th century to the present day, and it is from this that the significance of the DPCA, insofar as it relates to this case, is principally derived.
6. The most notable characteristic of the sub-area including the appeal site is described in the AMS as "the larger scale of development with the predominant built form being higher and denser than other parts of the conservation area". This is seen most notably in the early 20th century five-storey mansion blocks on either side of Lissenden Gardens. Glenhurst Avenue itself mainly comprises two terraces of two- and three-storey Arts and Crafts houses (some of which, like the appeal property, are now sub-divided into flats). The AMS highlights that minor alterations and the loss of some original details on Glenhurst Avenue have detracted from the pattern of roofs and porches, and particularly emphasises the replacement of windows as a negative feature. Nevertheless, the terraces as a whole make a positive contribution to the streetscape and the quality of the DPCA.
7. The Council's 2021 *Home Improvements* Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance ("the SPG") sets out a variety of advice in respect of roof alterations and balconies. For dormers it advises that the type, design and alignment of windows should relate to the ones below, and that the hierarchy of window openings (generally meaning that windows on dormers are smaller than those at lower levels) should also be considered. There are several rear dormers of a variety of sizes and styles on the part of Glenhurst Avenue including the appeal property meaning it already has a somewhat disjointed roofscape, though the visual impact of this on the DPCA is limited because they are at the back of the terrace.
8. While the proposed doors allowing access to the balcony would be taller than the windows they would replace, they would be set the same distance back from the edge of the roof and so would not be prominent in views from the gardens at the rear of the block. The party walls which rise a considerable way above the roof slope would also provide some screening in oblique views. The doors would be wider than, and not especially well related to the hierarchy or design of, the existing windows below. However, that could also be said of the existing dormer and its windows (and, indeed, other dormers on the block) and, while existing harm is not a justification for allowing further unacceptable harm, the discreet siting and relatively small scale of the dormer means that the doors would not be unacceptably intrusive, nor would they otherwise exacerbate any existing harm.
9. In respect of roof terraces, the SPG advises that they should be set within the roof slope when possible, and that handrails and balustrades should be set back behind the line of the roof slope. The steel railings here would be set back from the edge of the roof, but would nevertheless rise above the roof slope. Again, however, the party walls on either side (particularly on the east, next to No 28) would provide considerable screening in oblique views and, while the railings

would be visible from surrounding flats and gardens, they would mainly be viewed against (and assimilated into the backdrop of) the building, rather than standing out against the skyline. They would not therefore be a dominant or harmfully intrusive feature.

10. The proposed development would not comply with all the advice in the SPG, notably those aspects I have highlighted in paragraph 7 above. However, for the reasons I have set out in paragraphs 8 and 9, I do not consider that this would lead to any unacceptable visual harm. Furthermore, the use of timber frames would also be more sympathetic to the character of the surrounding buildings than the uPVC of the existing dormer windows. On balance, and taking everything which has been put before me into account, I find that the development would not cause harm to the appearance of the host dwelling or the surrounding area.
11. Accordingly, I conclude that the character and appearance of the DPCA would be preserved, and its significance as a designated heritage asset would not be harmed. As such, the proposed development would comply with Policies D1 and D2 of the 2017 Camden Local Plan and Policies DC2 and DC3 of the 2020 Dartmouth Park Local Plan. Together, and among other things, these policies seek to secure high quality design which responds to and integrates with local surroundings and context, and to preserve and enhance designated heritage assets including the DPCA. The proposal would also comply with the requirements of the Framework relating to conserving and enhancing the historic environment.

Other Matters

12. In determining the planning application, the Council considered that the scope, nature and location of the proposed development meant that it would not cause any significant adverse impacts on the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, privacy or overlooking. Based on everything I saw during my site visit, I find no reason to take a different view on these points.
13. I have had regard to the other developments and alterations which have taken place within the DPCA and which were put to me in the appeal evidence. However, many of these related to proposals quite different in nature from the appeal scheme, or in different character areas within the DPCA. None were determinative factors in this appeal – my decision has been reached based on the specific planning merits of the proposed development.

Conditions

14. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have specified the approved plans so as to provide certainty. In order to protect the character and appearance of the area I have also included a condition requiring materials matching the existing dwelling to be used for the extension.

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

M Cryan

Inspector