



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 March 2007

by **Philip Willmer** BSc Dip Arch RIBA.

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: 26 March 2007

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/E/06/2030142

**15 Albert Street, London, NW1 7LU.**

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Katherine Pahl against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application (Ref.2006/1293/L), dated 13 March 2006, was refused by the Council by notice dated 26 May 2006.
- The works proposed are described as “construction of mansard roof extension to create new bedrooms on third floor. Insertion of bathroom into second floor”.

---

## Appeal Ref: APP/X5120/A/06/2030141

**15 Albert Street, London, NW1 7LU.**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant [outline] planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Katherine Pahl against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application (Ref.2006/0878/P), dated 13 February 2006, was refused by notice dated 26 May 2006.
- The development proposed is described as “the construction of a mansard roof extension (behind the front parapet), to house 2 no. bedrooms and 1 no. bathroom”.

---

## Decision

1. I dismiss these appeals.

## Inspector's Reasons

2. Number 15 Albert Street, which is listed grade II and lies within the Camden Town Conservation Area, is a three storey mid-terrace dwelling house with basement and a small bathroom/store addition to the rear at roof level. This addition has led to the loss of part of the butterfly parapet to the rear elevation. Nevertheless just over 50% has been retained. In my opinion the butterfly parapet, the publicly visible manifestation of the original valley roof contributes to the special interest of this property and the character and appearance of the terrace in the conservation area. While numbers 17, 19 and 21 no longer have their butterfly parapets, I saw that a number of properties still do, including number 13 next door. The rhythm of the original parapets can therefore still be appreciated from both the public and private realm. Although the butterfly parapets to the properties in Albert Street may not

be mentioned in the Conservation Area Statement, I believe they nevertheless, make an important contribution to the townscape of the area.

3. It is proposed to construct a mansard roof extension to provide additional residential accommodation at roof level. The design before me proposes the loss of the remaining section of the butterfly parapet. Planning Policy Guidance 15 *Planning and the Historic Environment* (PPG15) at Annex C advises that the roof is nearly always a dominant feature of a building and the retention of its shape, amongst other things, is important. I consider that if the last and slightly larger section of original parapet were to be removed this would cause significant harm to the special architectural and historic interest of this building as well as its historic fabric. This would, in turn, further erode the character of the terrace and thereby detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area.
4. Further, because of the design of the sheer masonry façade proposed to the rear, the visual transition between the varying heights of the parapets, currently provided by the small roof level addition, would be lost. This would in turn reinforce the apparent mass of the new extension when viewed alongside the neighbouring lower butterfly parapet. My concerns in respect of the massing of the rear elevation reinforce my conclusion in respect of this matter that the extension, as designed, would detract from the appearance and architectural character of the listed building and would be an unwelcome intrusion into the appearance of the conservation area at this point.
5. Alterations are proposed at second floor level to accommodate a new layout. I saw that these are of a relatively minor nature and, therefore, I do not consider they would cause any harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the property. Nevertheless, I conclude that the proposed roof extension, which would result in the loss of the remaining section of the original butterfly parapet roof, would be visually and architecturally unacceptable. To allow it would be to disregard the duties imposed by sections 16, 66 and 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and the guidance in PPG15 which are reflected in Policies B1, B3, B6 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement UDP, as they relate to the quality of development, the preservation of the architectural and historic interest of a listed building, and the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of conservation areas.
6. The appellant has drawn my attention to other roof conversions locally. Whatever the circumstances surrounding those developments each proposal falls to be considered on its own merits. Therefore, the fact that similar alterations have been found acceptable elsewhere is no reason why an inappropriate development should be allowed here.
7. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I consider that the appeals should not succeed.

*Philip Willmer*

Inspector