



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2007

by **Sue Glover BA (HONS) MCD 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

Decision date:
19 November 2007

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/07/2050590

97A Belsize Lane, London, NW3 5AU

- 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 Kregar Clive and Ms Yvonne Khong against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application (Ref 2007/2007/P), dated 16 April 2007, was refused by notice dated 15 June 2007.
- The development proposed is the removing of the existing roof to provide a new remodelled second floor using the existing rear and front terraces; an extension to the rear to create a glazed enclosure to the dining room; and remodelling of the entrance porch to create a new covered entrance lobby.

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. This side of the street is predominantly characterised by terraced blocks of housing of varying heights, but otherwise of a generally uniform appearance. The appeal dwelling and those adjoining are less regular in appearance and design having some variation in parapet heights and building lines but do not appear discordant. Although of no special architectural merit, the group of buildings is modest in scale and of an unassuming appearance within the street scene. As such, they do not significantly detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
4. There is no common roof form in this part of the street, but the existing hipped roof of the appeal building is set back and low in profile. The proposed roof extension would result in a significant increase in the building's height and bulk and appear prominent and overly dominant emphasising its block-like appearance. I consider that there would be a significant and unwelcome alteration of the form and proportions of the existing building resulting in a standard of design of insufficient high quality contrary to Policies B1 and B3 of the *London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan* (UDP). The proposal would therefore not preserve the character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area contrary to UDP Policy B7.
5. The proposal would also be contrary to the objectives of the *Camden Planning Guidance*, which encourages a high quality of design that respects and

enhances the character and appearance of the property and its surroundings. Although there are some prominent and discordant features in the street scene, notably the Tavistock Centre opposite, and the proposal would replicate existing details, these matters in my view do not justify the appeal proposal or outweigh the identified harm. For the reasons given above and having regard to the sustainable drainage benefits of the proposed green roof and the appellants' desire for usable second floor space, I conclude that the appeal proposal is unacceptable.

Sue Glover

INSPECTOR