



The Planning Inspectorate

An Executive Agency in the Department of the Environment and the Welsh Office

Room 1404
Tollgate House
Houlton Street
Bristol BS2 9DJ

**APPEALS
DISMISSED**

Direct Line 0117-987-8927
Switchboard 0117-987-8000
Fax No 0117-987-8769
GTN 1374-

Adrienne Hill BA MPhil MRTPI
The Manse
Windsor Lane
Little Kingshill
GREAT MISSENDEN
Bucks
HP16 0DZ

Your Ref:

Our Ref:

T/APP/X5210/A/96/262495/P7
T/APP/X5210/E/96/812292/P7

Date:

19 June 1996

Dear Madam

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 SECTION 78 AND SCHEDULE 6 AND
PLANNING (LISTED BUILDINGS AND CONSERVATION AREAS) ACT 1990
SECTION 20 AND SCHEDULE 3
APPEALS BY DONALD CAMPBELL
APPLICATION NOS: PL/9500754 and HB/9570133

1. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine these appeals against the decisions of the Council of the London Borough of Camden to refuse planning permission and listed building consent for a roof extension in the form of two dormer windows at **2 Provost Road, Hampstead**. I have considered the written representations made by you and by the Council and also those made by other parties and interested persons. I have also considered the representation made directly to the Council by the Eton Conservation Area Advisory Committee which has been forwarded to me. I inspected the site on 4 June 1996.

2. The appeal site is situated in the Eton Conservation Area. The character of the conservation area in the vicinity of the appeal site comprises mostly early nineteenth century semi-detached or detached villas set in well landscaped gardens. The building on the appeal site is listed Grade II, and all the listed buildings in Provost Road (from no. 1 to no. 19) are stated to form a group with all the listed buildings in Eton College Road and Eton Road.

3. From the written representations and from my site visit I consider the main issues in both appeals to be the effect of the proposal on the character of the listed building, and on the character or appearance of the Eton Conservation Area.

4. The development plan for the area includes the adopted Borough Plan. Objective UD11 is to retain, conserve and enhance areas and individual buildings of architectural quality or character, and policy UD15 states that alterations which would adversely affect the



100%
CYCLED PAPER

character, appearance or setting of listed buildings will not normally be permitted. The Council have quoted policy UD20 which states their objective that buildings of historic, architectural or townscape value be kept in a good state of repair, but I do not consider this policy, together with certain other policies quoted, to be of particular relevance to this appeal. Policy UD32 includes the statement that roof extensions should relate to the form and character of the building and its neighbours.

5. There is also a Deposit Draft Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which incorporates proposed changes following consultation; the Inspector's report following a Public Inquiry is expected imminently. While this Plan does not have the full weight of the development plan it is a material consideration. Policy EN33 states that the Council will seek to ensure that development in a conservation area preserves or enhances its special character and appearance, and policy EN35 that all development in a conservation area is to be of a high quality of design. Policy EN43 sets out the Council's intention that extensions to listed buildings will not normally be granted if they would not preserve its character as a building of special architectural or historic interest, while policy EN50 includes the Council's intention that an extension to an existing building should relate to the form, proportions and character of the building, and have regard to the historic pattern of development in the surrounding area.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) is a further material consideration. Under Section 15, which deals with roof alterations and extensions, 15.2 (a) seeks to restrict over-large dormers.

7. In reaching my decisions, I have had regard to the fact that Sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 require that special regard shall be had to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special interest which it possesses, and that Section 72(1) of the same Act requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

8. The house at no. 2 and the adjoining house at no. 1 form a pair. They are at the east end of Provost Road, and are similar in design to the other pairs of buildings up to no. 12. There is a gabled elevation facing the street, and the building is finished in stucco with finely detailed window surrounds. The slated roof slopes down from the ridge, which incorporates a long chimney stack, and overhangs the front projecting section of the building at both the verge and eaves. There is a raised parapet to the street face of the recessed part of the building which conceals a small section of roof, which then terminates at the face of the side elevation. The roof forms a subservient part of the building, providing a simple capping. The existing rooflight is flush with the roof and does not therefore detract from the form of the roof.

9. Due to the fact that the pairs of buildings at the east end of Provost Road have gaps between them, and in particular because there are substantial spaces between the projecting front sections of the villas, their side roofs are seen clearly when viewed obliquely from Provost Road and the other nearby roads. Most of the properties in the area have had roof extensions in the form of dormers of varying types and sizes. The proposal is for two long dormer windows to be provided to the side of the roof facing the neighbouring house, no. 3.

These would be similar in length to, but somewhat larger in section than the two dormers at no. 3, and in profile they would match the continuous box dormer at no. 1. The proposed dormers would occupy much of the length of the roof, and it is clear to me that they would substantially alter the character of the building by making the roof a much more dominant element. There are many examples in the surrounding area which illustrate only too well the prominence of similar dormers.

10. Government advice in C7 of Annex C of Planning Policy Guidance note 15 - Planning and the Historic Environment - is that modern extensions should not dominate the existing building. In this case I consider that the proposed dormers, by virtue of their scale, would dominate the existing villa. You have stated that your client would be prepared to accept dormers of a smaller profile to match those at no. 3, but I am dealing with the proposal before me.

11. You have argued that most of the buildings in the area have been provided with dormers and that the provision of the proposed dormers would balance the building with its neighbours. While this may be the case, I do not consider that it is acceptable to perpetuate designs which are out of character with the buildings in the interests of conformity. The oblique views of the dwellings at the east end of Provost Road have a much greater impact than the head-on views, and the value of symmetry with the roof extension at no. 1 would only be minimal. The insertion of dormer windows would erode the architectural integrity of the listed building which I consider it would be very desirable to preserve. You have stated that you consider the large number of dormers which have already been provided to dwellings in the vicinity to be a relevant precedent; nevertheless I am considering this appeal on its own merits.

12. You have also argued that the roof at no. 2 is not very visible from the street due to the presence of a large tree in front of the house. There are nevertheless significant views of it from various points, particularly from Provost Road further to the west; in any event, the tree has a finite life. I conclude that the proposal would cause significant harm to the character and appearance of the building. It would be contrary to objective UD11 and policy UD15 of the Borough Plan, and also to policy UD32 in respect of its relation to the form and character of the building. It would further be contrary to Deposit Draft UDP policy EN35 with regard to the design of the dormers, policy EN43 in respect of its effect on the character of the building, and to policy EN50. It would not comply with 15.2(a) of the SPG as it would be over-large because of its dominance.

13. I turn to my second issue. Inspection of the buildings in the surrounding area reveals that the original character of the conservation area has been altered over the years, and you have argued that part of the character of the Eton Conservation Area is the way in which it has evolved over time. This change is due to a large extent to insensitive additions to the roofs. Nevertheless the existing roofscape must be considered to be part of the character of the conservation area. In that respect I consider that the proposal would preserve the character of the Eton Conservation Area, and it would not be contrary to policy EN33 of the Draft Deposit UDP.

14. I have taken into account all of the other matters raised, including your client's needs for additional headroom in the top floor bedrooms, and do not find them to outweigh the considerations that have led me to my decision.

15. For the reasons given above and in exercise of the powers transferred to me, I hereby dismiss these appeals.

Yours faithfully

Frederick Steyn

FREDERICK F STEYN BArch RIBA
Inspector