

---

# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 March 2016

**by Elizabeth Pleasant BSc(Hons)DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 31 March 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/15/3141527**

**6 Glenmore Road, London, Camden NW3 4DB**

- 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 Mr Pierson Austin against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2015/4915/P, dated 26 August 2015, was refused by notice dated 21 October 2015.
  - The development proposed is erection of rear dormer and associated roof terrace in upper roof slope.
- 

## Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

## Procedural Matter

2. The Council altered the description of the development from 'addition of new rear dormer in roof' to 'erection of rear dormer and associated roof terrace in upper roof slope.' This is also the description used by the appellant on the appeal form. I consider that this is a more accurate description of the appeal proposal and I have therefore considered the appeal on his basis.

## Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect on the character and appearance of the host property and Belsize Conservation Area.

## Reasons

4. The appeal property forms part of an attractive terrace of two-storey Edwardian properties which also comprise an attic storey within a slate-faced mansard roof. Although the terraces within the street show variations, they are similar in design and there is a strong rhythm and consistency to their elevations. No 6 forms part of a symmetrical pair with No 4, and each property has a three light dormer within the lower half of the rear mansard roof. The upper halves of their roofs, with the exception of rooflights, remain free from any roof alterations. The property lies within Belsize Conservation Area and makes a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
5. The proposed development would introduce a dormer window and roof terrace into the rear upper roof slope of the property to provide additional attic

accommodation. The dormer window would be a similar width, with three lights, to reflect the scale and design of the existing rear dormer that would sit beneath it. However, when viewed together with the proposed roof terrace, which would cut into the existing mansard roof, its resultant form would appear as an incongruous alteration which would dominate the existing upper roof slope and detract from its simple original form. Furthermore, the alterations would unbalance the appearance of this symmetrical terrace pair and cause demonstrable harm to the intrinsic design characteristics and appearance of the host property. The appeal proposal would conflict with guidelines on roof extensions set out in the Belsize Conservation Area Statement which advise that proposals that change the shape and form of the roof are unlikely to be acceptable where it would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building or where the property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset.

6. I recognise that there are a variety of roof additions to properties both on Glenmore Road and neighbouring streets within Belsize Conservation Area. However, throughout these streets the original roof forms of individual properties vary in their design and in many instances the alterations that have taken place reflect or complement the original design characteristics of those roofs. In any event each case must be considered on its own merits. The upper slopes of the mansard roofs of the properties on the even numbered side of Glenmore Road, including the appeal property, all retain their original roof form, and furthermore the rear of these properties are clearly visible from Glenilla Road. This original roof form makes an important contribution to the townscape and I consider that such a characteristic should be retained to protect the overall character and appearance of Belsize Conservation Area.
7. The appeal proposals would harm the character and appearance of the host property and would fail to preserve the character and appearance of Belsize Conservation Area. It would cause less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area as a heritage asset. This harm is not outweighed by any public benefits, which includes any social benefit from the additional living accommodation the dormer and roof terrace would provide. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies in the National Planning Policy Framework which seek to conserve and enhance the historic environment and conflicts with Policies CS5 and CS14 of the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework, Core Strategy, 2010 and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden's Local Development Framework, Development Policies, 2010 which seek amongst other things, to achieve good design which respects the character and form of the existing building and preserve the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

### **Conclusion**

8. For the reasons set out above and taking into account all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Elizabeth Pleasant*

INSPECTOR