



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 October 2018

by **G Powys Jones MSc FRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 November 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/18/3208293

1 Spencer Rise, London, NW5 1AR

- 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 Edward Williams Architects against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2018/0930/P, dated 21 February 2018, was refused by notice dated 1 June 2018.
 - The development proposed is described as traditional mansard roof extension set back from the front parapet with two dormer windows.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. Having regard to the appeal property's location within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area (CA), the main issue is whether the proposed development would serve to preserve or enhance its character or appearance.

Reasons

3. The Council published a CA appraisal in 2009. I found the Appraisal to be a well-researched, comprehensive and informative document, defining the special interest of the area. Its content and proposals for the management of change attract significant weight in my deliberations.
4. Spencer Rise is comprised within the Dartmouth East sub area, as described in the Appraisal. Its paragraph 7.60 provides a description and historical background, whilst the next paragraph points out that:

Spencer Rise is one of the few streets in the conservation area which is marred by isolated mansard roof additions which have made their host building too prominent in the street.

5. I saw the mansard additions referred to and share the view that most are poorly designed and jar on the eye. Nevertheless, although generally resistant to roof extensions, the Appraisal advises that exceptions may be made:

'on the south side of Spencer Rise where the majority of the buildings in a distinct group already have roof extensions and a mansard roof would infill a gap and reunite the group.'

6. However, the appeal property is sited on the northern frontage of the Rise, being one of a small group of three distinctive dwellings displaying front
-

parapets, screening their butterfly roofs behind. Alongside this group, comprised within a terrace, stepped because of the topography, are three-storey properties displaying differing roof styles. The terrace as a whole, as it rises eastwards, is very pleasing to the eye.

7. In terms of its proportions, massing and materials the proposed mansard's design is superior to most currently on display in the street, and I note the attempt to adhere to the Council's general design guidance on constructions of this form.
8. But even if the property were sited on the southern frontage, this roof addition would not '*infill a gap and reunite the group*'. On the contrary, the mansard would be perceived as a harmful, incremental addition incongruously marring the pleasantly distinctive rhythms of the town/roofscape on display in this part of the Rise.
9. The appellant suggests, with reference to computer-generated imagery, that the mansard addition would not prove noticeable. I do not share that opinion. It would be clearly apparent from the front, and more apparent still in oblique views from the rising ground to the east.
10. I conclude that the proposed roof extension would harm the character and appearance of the CA, conflicting with those provisions of policies D1 & D2 of the Camden Local Plan directed to preserve and enhance the Borough's historical environment and heritage assets.
11. Having regard to national policy guidance I acknowledge that the proposal, if implemented, would cause less than substantial harm. But the public benefit identified by the appellant is, in my view modest, and does not outweigh the harm I have identified.

Other matters

12. The references to other development plan and national policies and guidance have been noted, but I consider those to which I have referred to be the most relevant.
13. Reference has been made to another appeal involving a mansard roof extension further up the hill at 49 Spencer Rise (*Ref APP/X5210/D/13/2190582, dated 21 February 2013*). Whilst the outcome of that appeal is similar to this, I have dealt with this appeal on its merits.
14. All other matters raised in the representations have been taken into account, including the views of a local resident and the Conservation Area Advisory Committee, but no other matter raised is of such strength or significance as to outweigh the considerations that led me to my conclusions.

G Powys Jones

INSPECTOR