



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 September 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 01 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3370707

46 Fairfax Road, Camden, London, NW6 4HA

- 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 Ms Rania Tobi against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2025/1082/P.
 - The development proposed is conversion of the existing garage into a living room with replacement of the existing garage door to window and erection of a part two storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effects of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the area, and upon the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers to the rear, especially at Nos 32a and 34 Belsize Road, with particular regard to visual impact.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal relates to a three-storey with mansard, end-of-terrace dwelling built in neo-Georgian style. It forms part of an enclave of similar properties in age and style along this particular stretch of Fairfax Road to its east side and replicated to the rear along Belsize Road. The property has a deeply recessed double-width garage attached to its side, which in turn forms part of a block of four, beyond which is a six-storey block of flats at Byron Court. On the opposing side of Fairfax Road is a linear 4-storey block with a ground floor shopping parade and flats above. The proposal seeks to convert the garage into living space, with a first and second-floor extension to the house over part of the garage's existing floor plan.
4. The front face of the existing attached garage is recessed behind the dwelling's front elevation by around 8m. The overlap, where the buildings are attached, measures around 2m, with the garage projecting beyond the rear of the dwelling by around a further 4m. As a single-storey garage, and part of a larger block, there is a cohesion between these component parts of the existing property, with the garage seen as an obviously subservient and utilitarian part of its overall composition.
5. Although the proposed extension would project the style and profile of the existing dwelling sideways, with matching eaves lines and roof heights, its deeply recessed position would fail to facilitate an obvious visual continuation of the dwelling or

wider terrace. Furthermore, I find the side extension to be out of proportion with the existing house; on the one hand, too wide to appear as a secondary and subservient extension obviously associated with the host property, or otherwise too small to give the impression of an additional property at the end and part of the terrace as a whole.

6. The proposal's lack of proportionality as an extension to the house would be further emphasised by the fenestration pattern. The front dormer to the mansard roof on the extension would be larger and more dominant than those on the original roof. The first-floor French-windows would be taller than those on the existing dwelling and would lack the existing building's brick detailing. When taken with the large ground floor window on the converted garage, matched in size to the existing, I find the proposal would be seen to compete with, rather than complement, the scale, form, and detailing of the original dwelling.
7. Overall, by reason of its size, position, and detailing, I find the proposal would appear as a poorly conceived and dominant adjunct to No 46 that would be incongruous in its setting and harmful to the character and appearance of the area. As such, it would fail to display the quality of design that is required by Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 (CLP) and would conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's (the Framework) objectives for achieving well-designed places.
8. The appellant has pointed to an extension to the side of 34 Fairfax Road. This was granted planning permission in 2011 (Ref 2011/0739/P). I accept that the contextual setting between the appeal property and No 34 is similar. However, I find the works executed at No 34 to be more considered and proportionate to the host dwelling, appearing as a secondary and appropriately respectful addition. The extension at No 34 does not alter my conclusions on the first main issue in this case.

Living Conditions

9. The appeal property, including the garage block attached to the side, backs on to the gardens of a terraced row at Nos 32, 32a, 34 and 34a Belsize Road. Fairfax Road and Belsize Road do not run parallel but converge a short distance to the south, where they sit next to each other at a five-limbed roundabout junction. Consequently, the respective sizes of dwellings' back gardens diminish considerably as the two roads converge and space between buildings becomes tight. The rear gardens to the four houses at Nos 32-34a illustrate this point, being very shallow where they back on to the appeal property and the garage block.
10. As a single-storey structure, the garage block gives significant relief in the outlook from Nos 32a to 34a in particular, where the rear gardens and separation distances between neighbouring buildings is most restricted. The absence of any built form at first-floor level and above creates an important break between the three-storey scale of the terraced houses along Fairfax Road, and the adjacent high-rise block at Byron Court.
11. The partial infilling at first and second floor above the garage to No 46 would create an increased sense of enclosure, especially to the rear of Nos 32a and 34, where its visual presence would be most felt. Whilst the addition would not extend as deep as the existing garage, it would nevertheless impose itself at close quarters in the outlook from the rear of the adjoining properties, and when seen from the small rear garden spaces, as a visually dominant and overbearing structure. Whilst I accept

that there would not necessarily be any harm from increased levels of overlooking due to the existing first and second floor windows at No 46, and no evidence before me to demonstrate that there would be any loss of sunlight or daylight, the visual harm imposed by the new building's presence would be significant. Any comparison between other back-to-back properties along Fairfax and Belsize Roads, including the past extension at No 34, or arguments such that the area is already highly built-up, fails to take account of the specific size and unique context of the rear gardens at this point, and does not alter my findings on the second main issue in this case.

12. The failure to protect the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers at Nos 32a and 34 Belsize Road means that there would be conflict with CLP Policy A1, and further conflict with the Framework where it seeks to secure a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR