



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 31 October 2025

by **S Poole BA(Hons) DipArch MPhil MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/25/3373315

22b Ellerdale Road, London NW3 6BB

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs James Goolnik against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref is 2025/3126/P.
 - The development proposed is described on the application form as the erection of a mansard roof extension, a first floor rear extension, a replacement single storey rear addition and a first floor front bay extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is a two-storey inter-war building that was originally ancillary to 22 Ellerdale Road before being converted into an independent dwelling following a grant of planning permission in 1953. The property is situated within the Fitzjohns Netherhall Conservation Area (CA) which is notable for the late 19th and early 20th century Queen Anne Revival and Arts and Crafts style housing set in a context of mature trees. In the context of the grand villas to either side the appeal property is a diminutive element in the street scene and makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the CA.
4. Planning permission was granted in 2005¹ for works to the appeal property that included the erection of a single-storey ground floor extension to the rear, a first floor extension at the front and a roof addition. This permission has lapsed.
5. The proposal would comprise the erection of ground floor additions to the side and rear, first floor additions at the front and rear and a roof extension to provide 2 bedrooms and a shower room. The amount of additional floorspace proposed would far exceed that granted planning permission in 2005. In particular, the

¹ Application ref: 2005/3250/P

appeal proposal would extend rearwards a significant distance into the garden which was not part of the 2005 scheme.

6. The additions would predominately have flat roofs. At the front the roof extension would feature a mansard-style frontage incorporating rooflights, and the first floor addition would have a steep crown roof form at the front. To the rear the roof addition would have a vertical tile-clad elevation featuring a pair of French doors and Juliet balconies.
7. The proposed front and roof additions would, due to their height and massing, significantly increase the property's presence and visibility. In particular, by comparison to the existing receding pitched roof the "mansard" with its 3 rooflights would be highly conspicuous and wholly alien and incongruous feature in this context.
8. At present the rear elevation of the appeal property extends a short distance beyond the rear elevations of the villas to either side. The rear addition would extend the ground floor further beyond the rear elevations of the villas to either side. As a consequence of this the footprint of the dwelling would be at odds with the pattern of development in this portion of Ellerdale Road. In addition, this would result in the reduction of garden space which is a key characteristic of the CA.
9. Due to its height, bulk, massing, footprint and appearance I therefore conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable effect on the character and appearance of the host building and result in substantial harm to, and therefore a failure to preserve, the CA. As such the proposal is contrary to Policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 which, amongst other matters, seek to ensure that development respects local context and preserves or enhances heritage assets. The proposal is also contrary to Policy DH1 of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2025-2040 which states that poor quality development will not be supported.
10. The appellant has referred to an appeal² allowed in 2022 for development at 4 Ellerdale Close described as "*replacement side and front extensions (and reduction) and alterations to the existing fenestrations and alterations to hard landscaping at the front of the property*". There is limited evidence before me to indicate that the allowed scheme at No.4 is directly comparable to the appeal proposal in respect of the bulk and impact of front additions, and in any event, as each application and appeal needs to be considered on its individual merits I attribute limited weight to this matter.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should fail.

S Poole

INSPECTOR

² Appeal ref: APP/X5210/D/22/3291770