



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 March 2007

**by Philippa Jarvis BSc (Hons) DipTP 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  
e-mail: [enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@planning-inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk)

Date: 27 April 2007

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/06/2029288**

**7 Falkland Road, Kentish Town, London NW5 2PS.**

- 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 Jan Dunning against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application, Ref 2006/2776/P, dated 9 June 2006, was refused by notice dated 10 August 2006.
- The development proposed is a remodelling of existing residential accommodation comprising new flat top mansard roof addition and new rear full width single-storey addition. Creating at ground floor new family room, dining room, toilet and kitchen. Creating at third floor new bedroom and ensuite.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal in relation to the new flat top mansard roof addition.
2. I allow the appeal in relation to the new rear full width single-storey addition at 7 Falkland Road, Kentish Town, London NW5 2PS, and grant planning permission in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2006/2776/P, dated 9 June 2006, and the plans submitted therewith, insofar as they relate to that part of the development, subject to the following conditions:
  - 1) The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this decision.

## Reasons

3. The appeal site lies within a terrace of mainly three storey Victorian properties. They are of rendered finish in different colours with parapet roofs to the front. These parapet roofs disguise low pitched 'butterfly' roofs over the main part of the dwelling, the rear elevations of which are visible from Leverton Street. Although no. 1 Falkland Road is two-storey with minor changes to the rear roof, the remaining properties are all three-storey with only minor alterations; in particular there have been no alterations to interrupt the roof forms. In my view the whole terrace formed by nos. 1 to 13 Falkland Road forms a cohesive row, with nos. 5, 7 and 9 in particular of uniform appearance.

### *Flat top mansard roof addition*

4. In relation to the proposed mansard roof addition, I note that it would be set back from the front parapet roof. However, the proposal involves the increase in height of the party wall and chimney with the height of the new flat-roofed mansard extending above the height of the existing chimney. The top of the existing chimney is just visible in the street scene of Falkland Road therefore, in my opinion, the upper part of the proposed roof extension

would be visible in this street scene. Furthermore, the mansard roof addition would be clearly visible in views from Leverton Street to the east of the site. The existing butterfly roofs along the rear of this terrace at third floor level remain in tact, the only addition being at the far western end with a small addition to no. 3, but not in the form of a mansard roof such as that now proposed. I consider that the proposed mansard roof addition would interrupt the uniformity of this mainly unbroken and unimpaired roof form. It would thereby be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and area in general.

5. I note that a number of properties in the surrounding area of the appeal site have mansard roof additions. However, given the number that have been installed, they appear as established features of the terraces of which they are a part and do not appear as interruptions to the roof forms in this instance. In addition, I am not aware of the circumstances in which such additions were permitted. In considering the proposal before me I have taken into account the particular site circumstances as referred to above and determined it on its merits.
6. I conclude that the proposed mansard roof extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and thereby conflicts with policy B1 and B3 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan, 2006, and with the guidance relating to roofs and terraces contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled *Development*, dated July 2002 which aim to protect local character. I note the appellant's comments regarding the Council's dealings with the roof extension but this is not a matter before me.

*Rear full width single-storey addition*

7. It is clear from the Council's decision notice that they only object to the roof extension. The proposed single-storey rear conservatory addition would adjoin, but not extend in depth beyond, the side walls of existing rear projections on both adjacent properties. It would not introduce any harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of those properties. In my view it would be subservient in appearance and would not appear bulky due to the use of glazing to the elevations and roof. It would respect the original design of the dwelling and pattern of development in the terrace. A reasonable garden area would be retained. I conclude that it would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area and would thus comply with policies B1 and B3 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan, 2006, and with the guidance relating to alterations and extensions contained in Supplementary Planning Guidance entitled *Development*, dated July 2002.
8. As the ground floor extension is separate from the roof extension I see no reason why permission cannot be granted for this element and I therefore intend to make a split decision. No conditions were suggested by the Council and in my opinion only a time limit condition would be appropriate. I note that the Council consider that the extension could be erected as permitted development. Whether or not the single storey rear extension requires planning permission is not a matter before me and I have dealt with the appeal as submitted.

*P. B. Jarvis*

INSPECTOR