



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 March 2007

**by Gareth A Rennie BSc (Hons) MRTPI  
FRGS**

**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](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

**Date: 20 July 2007**

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/06/2026696**

**96 Highgate West Hill, London, N6 6NR**

- 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 & Mrs Narraway against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2006/1169/P, dated 6 March 2006, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2006.
- The development proposed is a loft conversion.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Procedural Matter

2. Since the Council made their decision, the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP) was adopted in June 2006 and now represents the development plan for the area. I have therefore made my decision with reference to the policies within that plan.

## Reasons

3. The appeal property is within the Holly Lodge Conservation Area (CA). The CA contains a number of detached and semi-detached houses of varying styles within large gardens. The dominant roof style within the CA is hipped. An important aspect of their character is the regularity of their layout and their often complex but consistently hipped rooflines, emphasised by the fact that there has been little alteration to them.
4. The appeal property has a gable to the front and a hipped roof. A particular feature is the narrow tall chimney stacks. The proposal is for the conversion of the existing main hipped roof to provide additional accommodation and staircase. The existing side elevation would be extended upwards, with a dormer and roof lights installed within the rear pitch.
5. Policy B1 of the UDP says that development should, amongst other factors, respect its site and setting. Policy B3 says that the Council will not grant planning permission for alterations and extensions that it considers cause harm to the architectural quality of the existing building or to the surrounding area. In assessing this, the Council will consider the form, proportions and character of the building and its setting are respected. Policy B7 says that in a CA the

Council will only grant consent for development in a CA that preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the area. The Council has adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and section 2.8 of this deals with roofs and terraces.

6. The raising of the height of the side wall and the infilling of the roof space between the chimney stacks represents an inelegant solution to the need for more space within the property and would significantly harm the principle design feature of the hipped roof and its relationship to the chimney stacks. The resulting roof form would be an incongruous addition to the existing property and would adversely affect the character and appearance of No 96. For the same reasons it would also adversely affect the character and appearance of the wider streetscape and erode the character of the CA.
7. In addition, the appeal site is in an elevated position at the edge of the CA. This gives the appeal site a degree of prominence, particularly from the uphill side. This would serve to further emphasise the proposed changes to the side elevation and roofline and accentuate its jarring quality. The rear dormer would not be visible from the street and could be incorporated, together with the proposed roof lights, within the appeal property without harming the roofline or the character of the building. However, I do not think that within the design submitted either element is separable from the other.
8. As a result I conclude that the proposal is contrary to policies B1, B3, and B7 of the UDP and the aims of the SPG.
9. The appellant has also brought to my attention an example of other developments that has been carried out in the area. However, those schemes differ in siting and circumstances from that in this appeal, which I have determined on its own merits.
10. Consequently for the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Gareth A. Rennie*

Inspector