



**Appeal Decision** RECEIVED 17 MAY 2005

Site visit made on 5 April 2005

**by David Harrison BA Dip TP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the First Secretary of State**

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/09 Kite Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN  
☎ 0117 372 6572  
e-mail enquiries@planning-  
inspectorate.gsi.gov.uk

Date

21

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/05/1172270**  
**18 Churchill Road, London NW5 1AN**

- 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 Round One Properties against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref: 2004/3679/P, dated 6 August 2004, was refused by notice dated 13 October 2004.
- The development proposed is the erection of a mansard roof extension to accommodate two bedrooms.

**Summary of Decision: The appeal is dismissed.**

#### **Site description**

1. No.18 Churchill Road is a three storey end of terrace house lying on the southern edge of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area which was designated in 1992. At the time of my inspection it was unoccupied and was undergoing extensive renovation.

#### **Planning policy**

2. The development plan comprises the Camden Unitary Development Plan (UDP) 2000. Policies in the plan broadly aim to secure a high standard of built development and to protect and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas. In July 2002 the Council adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) which relates to roof extensions/alterations. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement includes further informal planning guidance.

#### **Main issue**

3. The main issue is whether the development would have the effect of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

#### **Assessment**

4. UDP Policy EN14 (Setting of new development) states that the Council will take into account the impact of development proposals on existing views and skylines. Policy EN24 states that the Council will resist inappropriate extensions at roof level with regard to various criteria including the integrity of terraces. Policy EN31 reflects national policy and seeks to ensure that development in conservation areas preserves or enhances their special character or appearance and is of high quality in terms of design, materials and execution.
5. The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement describes the conservation area as having a variety and complexity that charts the history of domestic architecture from the

late 18<sup>th</sup> Century to the present day. Churchill Road slopes down to the west from Dartmouth Park Hill to York Rise. The north side of Churchill Road has a four storey residential block dating from the 1950s at its eastern end. The western end of the road (Nos.12 to 29, which include the appeal premises) is made up of a series of terraces dating from the 1870s. These buildings are included in a schedule of non-listed properties which make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the conservation area.

6. Paragraph DP24 of the Conservation Area Statement points out that a roof extension is unlikely to be acceptable where, among other things, (1) it would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building, (2) the property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely, but not necessarily completely, unimpaired, (3) the property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset, or (4) the roof is prominent, particularly in long views. The Council maintains that the proposed mansard roof would be prominent and would conflict with all four aspects of this guidance.
7. The appellant maintains that the roof extension would cause no visual harm, particularly as it would not be seen from street level from a position immediately opposite the property. I agree that it would be hidden behind the parapet from this viewpoint, and it would also not be visible on the uphill approach from the west. However, the adjacent terrace to the east is only two storeys, allowing a clear view of the upper part of the gable end of No.18 from this direction. The mansard roof would be clearly visible on the downhill approach from the east along Churchill Road, and the profile of the roof would be significantly changed.
8. The mansard roof would also be clearly visible from the houses to the rear in Spencer Rise, from where the uniform appearance of the row of four butterfly roofs at the rear of Nos. 18 to 21 would be significantly altered. In my opinion the mansard would strike an incongruous note. It would be a harmful addition to the roofscape of Churchill Road and would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.
9. The appellant refers to other roof additions, including some in Spencer Rise, which I saw from the rear windows of the appeal building, and to the wide range of different aged properties in the conservation area, including recent buildings which do not make a positive contribution to its character. However, these considerations do not weigh in favour of allowing the appeal.
10. I conclude that the proposed mansard roof extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and would conflict with the aims of policies in the adopted development plan and with the advice in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

#### **Formal Decision**

11. I dismiss the appeal.



Inspector