
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 29 March 2017

by Roy Merrett BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 April 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/17/3167398
Flat C, 58 Minster Road, London NW2 3RE

- 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 James Goudie against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/3202/P, dated 9 June 2016, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a side dormer and the insertion of rooflights into the front, side and rear roof slopes.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a side dormer and the insertion of rooflights into the front, side and rear roof slopes at Flat C, 58 Minster Road, London NW2 3RE in accordance with the application Ref 2016/3202/P, dated 9 June 2016 and subject to the following conditions:-
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: P-07; E-01; P-06 A; P-05 G; P-11 B.
 - 3) No development shall commence until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dormer extension hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Procedural Point

2. For clarification I have amended the description of development to that given on the Council's decision notice as reflected on the appeal form.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed side dormer extension on the character and appearance of the host building and the wider street scene.
-

Reasons

4. The appeal property is within a residential area, characterised by large two storey semi-detached buildings set along a wide and sloping tree-lined street. It is part of a series of three semi-detached buildings with hipped roofs and which are very similar to one another in scale and appearance.
5. Although the aforementioned group of properties do not incorporate side dormers, there are other examples of this type of feature along the street, albeit that the Council has cited a case which it deems not to be in accordance with approved plans.
6. Notwithstanding this, the proposed side dormer would appear relatively small in the context of the overall area of the hipped roof plane in which it would be inserted. Furthermore it would be markedly set back from the front elevation of the building and would maintain reasonable clearance with the eaves and side edge of the main roof and even greater separation with the main ridgeline.
7. Accordingly the dormer would appear subordinate to the main dwelling and would be screened to a large extent by the projection of the adjacent building when viewed at distance from further along the street. From closer range the dormer would be visible. However to a significant extent this would be against the backdrop of the main roof which, similarly coloured, would serve to visually absorb the structure. The development would not therefore tend to naturally draw the eye. Whilst the profile of the dormer would be more visible from directly opposite the site, this would only be fleetingly apparent in passing the property and its relatively limited size and set back on the roof plane would give the structure a recessive quality.
8. I therefore conclude that the proposed side dormer would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the host building and the wider street scene. Accordingly it would not conflict with Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Core Strategy 2010; Policy DP24 of the London Borough of Camden Development Policies 2010 and Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015 insofar as they seek to promote the highest standard of design that protects the character of existing buildings and the surrounding area. Whilst the proposal would not strictly accord with all of the guidelines regarding dormer roof extensions contained in the Council's Design Planning Guidance 2015, in as much as it would not align precisely with lower floor windows and it might be argued that the dormer would interrupt an unbroken roofscape, the particular circumstances of this case, as set out above, are considered to justify the development.

Conditions and Conclusion

9. For the above reasons, I conclude that the appeal should succeed and planning permission be granted.
10. Conditions specifying the plans and requiring details to be agreed of the materials to be used in the external surfaces of the dormer extension are needed to safeguard the character and appearance of the area.

Roy Merrett INSPECTOR