



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 November 2006

by **P A Davies** BSc(Econ) MCD Dip.URS 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: 5 December 2006

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/06/2021707**

**43 Willow Road, Hampstead, London NW3 1TS**

- 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 Dr J Stern against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application, Ref: 2006/1501/P, dated 24 March 2006, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2006.
- The development proposed is described as to provide new dormer window in place of existing "velux" window to serve new en-suite bathroom to existing attic room.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Reasons

2. The appellant's house is situated in a short terrace of properties within the Hampstead Conservation Area. I consider the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area to be the main issue in this appeal. The Conservation Area has a variety of building types, ages and designs. The residential streets near the Heath contain attractive terraces of Victorian houses, intermixed with more modern buildings.
3. The proposed dormer extension would be constructed on the rear roof slope of the building, where it would be clearly visible from Gayton Terrace and certain vantage points in Gayton Road. I have taken into account that there is an existing rear dormer at the next-door house (no. 44), and that there are also rear dormers and roof terraces on some of the other properties in the terrace. However, the roof of the appellant's house and the adjoining end-of-terrace property (no. 42) is separate from and at a lower level than the roofs of the other houses in the terrace. Although it has two roof lights, there are no dormers or other extensions. Contrary to the Council's adopted supplementary planning guidance, the proposed dormer would extend to the ridge of the roof, such that it would project into the roof line when viewed from the street. Furthermore, the proposed windows in the dormer, as a consequence of their size and positioning, would, in my opinion, relate unsatisfactorily to the windows on the lower floors of the building. I therefore consider that the proposed extension would unacceptably affect the form and proportions of the existing roof and would be architecturally unsympathetic to the character of the building. Because of its prominent position, it would materially detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

4. I have noted the many examples of dormer roof extensions to which the appellant has drawn my attention. However, the Council states that these were constructed before the adoption of the Unitary Development Plan and supplementary planning guidance, which introduced more stringent policies and guidelines on roof extensions. Irrespective of whether the Council has applied its own policies consistently, I do not regard these developments as a good reason for allowing the appeal. I am firmly of the view that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and fails to accord with the provisions of Policies B1 and B3 of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan (2006). Whilst I note the appellants' wish to provide additional accommodation for their family, this is not a consideration that justifies permitting the development. Having considered all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*PA Davies*

INSPECTOR