



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 January 2026

by **L Clark BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3376183

19 Bassett Street, Camden, London NW5 4PG

- 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 Tom Young against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref is 2025/2130/P.
- The development proposed is removal of the existing butterfly roof and construction of a new roof at a higher level, with a roof terrace at the front.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, and whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the West Kentish Town Conservation Area (the CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site (No 19) lies within the CA and, under s72(1) of the Act, it is my duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the CA.
4. No 19 is a three-storey mid-terraced property adjoining the former Albert Hall, now The Church in Bassett St (the church). Ground levels rise towards Queen Crescent, and the Church visually splits Bassett Street into two. In its appearance, No 19 is consistent with other properties within the terrace and the CA. It has a traditional 'butterfly' or 'M' roof consisting of two shallow pitches meeting in a central valley running front to back, concealed behind a front parapet. I saw that the roofscape of the terrace was largely unimpaired.
5. The Council's West Kentish Town Conservation Area Statement (CAS) adopted in 2005 identifies No 1, 1a – 59 (odd) on Bassett Street as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the CA. Based on my observations, the significance of this part of the CA is largely derived from its architectural merit with properties set within long terraces, which are mainly unaltered and experienced from the main front elevation within the streets they are set.
6. Camden Planning Guidance – Home Improvements 2021 (CPG) states, amongst other matters, that a successful roof extension should consider the overall roof form of the existing building and adjoining buildings. It goes on to state that new development should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the CA and respect existing features such as rooflines. The Council's CAS sets out that roof extensions are unlikely to be acceptable where, amongst other matters, the

property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely but not necessarily unimpaired, and where the roof is prominent.

7. The positioning of No 19 is such that it also overlooks the junction of Bassett Street and Coity Road, an area of open space and the low-rise block of Cannington associated with the West Kentish Town Estate. Its position provides a relatively open aspect and a panoramic view of No 19 and the southern section of the terrace from both inside and outside of the CA.
8. The proposal would add a flat-topped, mansard-style roof extension with a flat-facing front, and rooflight to the rear to create additional living accommodation. The appellant's submitted plans show that the front elevation would be set back behind the parapet wall, almost half the depth of the property and located behind the closest forward-facing chimney stack. Whilst the appellant's plan¹ shows that the mansard roof would have a low profile, their comparison views (Viewpoint 1) taken approximately outside 42 Coity Road, shows that the upper section would be visible from within the streetscene.
9. With regard to Viewpoint 2, given the slight incline in ground levels when viewed from Rhyl Street and its setback from the front elevation, from the evidence before me and observations on site, it is unlikely that the proposed mansard would be visible.
10. When looking from Queens Crescent (Viewpoint 3), I saw that the Church is in the foreground of No 19 and that this largely obscures any views of No 19's roof. Given the setback of the proposed mansard, together with my observations, it is unlikely that the proposal would be visible from Viewpoint 3.
11. I also saw that Bassett Street was angled to Rhyl Street and that only a section of the rear elevation of the appeal site was visible from where I stood (Viewpoint 4). I could, however, see part of the upper floor and a section of the butterfly roof. Notwithstanding this, submitted plans show that the proposal would reinstate the rear butterfly roof profile. The retention of this feature would, in my mind, assist in the proposal assimilating into the predominant character of the rear elevation. Moreover, given the angle at which the rear elevation is positioned, together with the setback of the mansard, it is unlikely that the proposal would be visible from Viewpoint 4.
12. The Council contend that the proposal would be visible from higher levels of the rear elevations of nearby housing on Malden Road, Rhyl Street, Bassett Street and Coity Road. I acknowledge that the proposal would likely be visible from properties on Malden Road and Rhyl Street; however, I have found that the significance of the CA is largely derived from the architectural merits and experienced from the main front elevation. Given that these properties are largely to the rear, I do not agree that the proposed development would harm the significance within the rear, rather it would be a neutral factor in my determination of this appeal. Given that properties on Bassett Street are set alongside each other, from the evidence before me, the angle at which No 19 is located to other properties on the same side of the street would prevent any direct overlooking from other properties. Furthermore, I saw that properties on Coity Road were positioned to the front of No 19 and, from my observations, there would unlikely be any direct overlooking of the rear. Given my findings, I do not concur with the Council's view that there would be harm to the

¹ 3-01 PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

character or appearance of the CA when viewed from the rear of these properties, but it would be a neutral factor in my determination of this appeal.

13. The appellant does not dispute that the mansard would be visible from within the CA, particularly from Coity Road. Given this, together with my findings above, the addition of a mansard would alter a mainly unbroken and uniform roofscape, which would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the CA. The level of harm, however, would be less than substantial and, in my mind, would be at the lower end of the spectrum.
14. Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 (Local Plan) relates to design. Criterion b. states that development should preserve or enhance the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 Heritage. Local Plan Policy D2 states, amongst other matters, that the Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of a designated heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal convincingly outweigh that harm.
15. Paragraph 215 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that where a development will lead to less than substantial harm, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Furthermore, in terms of public benefits, the Planning Practice Guidance advises that they should be of a nature or scale to be of benefit to the public at large and not just a private benefit.
16. I acknowledge that the proposal would provide additional living accommodation for the appellant and assist them in insulating the roof, which would improve their living conditions during summer and winter. This would, however, be a private benefit to the appellant. There would also likely be a small temporary economic benefit during the construction. From the evidence before me, the benefits would be largely private, and I have not been made aware of any public benefits arising from the proposal that would outweigh the harm I have identified.
17. Consequently, there would not be clear and convincing justification for harm to, or loss of significance of, the designated heritage asset as required by paragraph 213 of the Framework, nor would the great weight that should be given to the heritage asset's conservation be outweighed.
18. In the absence of public benefit, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the host property and the CA. Consequently, the proposed development would conflict with Local Plan Policies D1 and D2 insofar as they require development to preserve or enhance the heritage asset. There would also be conflict with the CPG.

Other Matters

19. The Council have drawn my attention to a number of properties, namely 12 Allcroft Road² (No 12) and 48-56 Coity Road³ (Nos 48-56) which have recent planning approvals for mansard roof extensions within the CA. I note that the Council contend that the circumstances surrounding those approvals are not considered applicable to the appeal; however, it has nevertheless submitted several plans and supporting documents in its evidence, which is before me.

² 2025/2252/P

³ 2023/1765/P, 2023/1766/P, 2023/1764/P, 2023/1763/P and 2023/1762/P

20. In the case of No 12, the proposed development would provide an additional dwelling to increase the housing numbers in the borough. This was considered to be a public benefit by the Council in its assessment which outweighed the harm to the heritage asset. In the case before me, the proposal would not provide any new dwellings and thereby not provide the same public benefits. I therefore agree with the Council that this example is not comparable to the appeal before me.
21. The Council contend that applications for Nos 48-56 were submitted as a group and that even though it acknowledged the proposed mansards would impact the properties within the terrace, it contended that the proposed roof alterations would not impact the established scale of the CA, given that this part of the CA was undergoing significant change to its context. I saw, however, that No 56 was the only property to have implemented its approval. Notwithstanding this, I also saw that Coity Road is located at an approximate right angle to the appeal site and contains a significantly smaller number of properties than those on Bassett Street. From the evidence before me and in the absence of anything to the contrary, I have no reason to take a different view.
22. I acknowledge that the proposal would assist in the additional insulation of the roof; however, I have nothing substantive before me to demonstrate that the insulation of No 19 could not be delivered in a less harmful way.
23. The behaviour of the Council with regard to the time it took between validation and decision, advice it gave during site meetings, and latterly the absence of communication with the named officer on the refusal notice, is not within the scope of my assessment, which must focus on the planning merits of the appeal proposal.

Conclusion

24. For the reasons given above, having regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

L Clark

INSPECTOR