



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 June 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 29 June 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/17/3171824

Grove Lodge, 9-11 Hampstead Lane, Hornsey, London N6 4RT

- 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 Stafford against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/6455/P, dated 12 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 6 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is described as revised rear dormers following approved application: 2015/4667/P and additional flat roof-lights to proposed flat roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. At the time of my visit works were taking place to the host building and scaffolding had been erected around the roof of the building and was covered in sheeting. However I was able to view the roof from the inside of the building and the rear of the roof from under the sheeting. I have also been provided with a number of photographs of the appeal site and the host building and am satisfied that I have sufficient information to enable me to assess the proposal.
3. In November 2015 planning permission was granted at the appeal site for extensions and alterations at roof level to create a new 2-bed dwelling unit (Ref 2015/4667/P). I have been provided with a copy of the approved plans for the application and note that two front rooflights and two rear dormers formed part of the proposal. At the time of my visit works were taking place to the host building though the dormers and rooflights that form the appeal proposal had not been installed.
4. The Council cited a number of policies from the London Borough of Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2016 (LP) in its reason for refusal. Whilst the LP has yet to be adopted, the Inspector's report on it was published on 15 May 2017 and the LP was found to be sound subject to the recommended modifications, none of which apply to the policies cited in the reason for refusal. Given the advanced stage of the LP, I have attached significant weight to it and in reaching my decision have had regard to the LP policies referred to by the Council.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear dormers on the character and appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it forms a part and the Highgate Village Conservation Area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is located in the Highgate Village Conservation Area (CA). The Council's Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS) describes the general character of the CA as a close-knit village crowning one of the twin hills to the north of London containing mainly 18th and 19th century buildings. The character of the CA is said to be formed by the relationship of topography, open spaces, urban form and architectural details with the appeal site falling within the Highgate Village Sub Area (Sub-Area One), the historic core of the CA. The CAAMS states that this area has the most intense development within the CA, rich in form and detail. The appeal site forms part of a 1880s terrace of five houses and the host building and its neighbours in the terrace are identified as positive buildings in the CAAMS.
7. The host building comprises a three storey plus basement traditional property located centrally within a small terrace of imposing and substantially scaled properties. The roof of the terrace, known as Grove Lodge, is largely unaltered with the exception of two traditional front dormers to either end and a small dormer and a number of rooflights at the rear. The host building and the wider terrace are located in a prominent position on Hampstead Lane with views of the rear roof of the terrace from The Grove.
8. As stated planning permission has previously been granted for alterations to the front and rear roof of the host building (Ref 2015/4667/P). The proposal would increase the number of rooflights to the front from two to four and would increase the number of rear dormers from two to three and increase the size of one of the dormers. Notwithstanding that the rear dormers are set within the rear roof slope, have been designed and positioned to align with fenestration below and would be constructed from high quality materials, they would nevertheless dominate the largely unimpaired rear roof slope of the host building when compared with those previously approved. The dormers by reason of their size, number and location would not be subordinate but rather would be obtrusive additions that would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, the wider terrace and the CA.
9. The proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA. I consider that the harm to the significance of the CA that would result from the proposal would be less than substantial. As such having regard to paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), this harm needs to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. Whilst the appellant states that the proposal would significantly improve the quality of living of future occupiers of the loft apartment by providing a sufficient amount of daylight and outlook to the rear garden, this does not equate to a public benefit which would outweigh the harm identified.
10. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the CA and would not meet the requirements of section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. For the same reasons it would not accord with

paragraph 132 of the Framework, with Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy, policies DP24 and DP25 of Camden's Development Policies 2010-2025 and policies A1, D1 and D2 of the emerging LP. These policies require, amongst other things, development to be of the highest standard of design, to consider the character of the existing building and neighbouring buildings and to preserve and enhance conservation areas.

Conclusion

11. For the above reasons and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR