
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 June 2017

by Beverley Wilders BA (Hons) PgDurp MRTPI

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

Decision date: 19 July 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/X5990/D/17/3171530

4 Clifton Hill, London NW8 0QG

- 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 & Mrs Zachary and Lisa Gozali against the decision of City of Westminster Council.
 - The application Ref 16/09834/FULL, dated 14 October 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 January 2017.
 - The development proposed is side first floor extension and addition of rear dormer window to existing dwelling house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a side first floor extension and addition of rear dormer window to existing dwelling house at 4 Clifton Hill, London NW8 0QG in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 16/09834/FULL, dated 14 October 2016, 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: 1160B-P-000, 1160B-P-001, 1160B-P-002, 1160B-P-003, 1160B-P-004, 1160B-P-101, 1160B-P-102, 1160B-P-103, 1160B-P-104 and 1160B-P-105.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matter

2. The Council's reason for refusal refers to the St John's Conservation Area. However it appears from the documentation that I have received from the Council that the correct title for the conservation area is the St John's Wood Conservation Area. I have therefore referred to it as such.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and St John's Wood Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in the St John's Conservation Area (CA). The general character of the CA is that of a leafy residential suburb with a relatively low density of development. There is a mixture of detached, semi-detached and terraced properties and buildings are generally of a domestic scale. Clifton Hill mainly contains large detached and semi-detached hipped roofed traditional dwellings set back slightly from the road with the appeal site being located at the end of the road near to the junction with Loudoun Road. A number of nearby dwellings have rear dormers visible from nearby roads.
5. The appeal site comprises a modern detached hipped roofed dwelling built in a traditional style set back from and fronting onto Clifton Hill. A dwelling of a similar age, design and scale is located adjacent to the site at 2 Clifton Hill, albeit this dwelling is set at an angle to the host building and fronts onto Loudoun Road. The dwelling at 6 Clifton Hill, to the other side of the appeal site, forms one half of a traditional pair of semi-detached dwellings and is of a more imposing scale and height than the host building. A single storey part of the host building adjoins the common side boundary with No 6 and No 6 has a single storey side extension, though this is set away from the side boundary. The rear elevations and rear gardens of dwellings on Clifton Hill back onto the rear elevations of dwellings on Springfield Road to the north with views of the rear elevations of these properties currently visible above the single storey part of the host building.
6. The host building and its neighbour at No 2 are of a different scale and have different proportions to the majority of nearby dwellings which are generally larger in scale with more vertical proportions. This together with the particular design of the first floor side extension which would be set back from the front elevation of the host building and set in from the common side boundary with No 6 means that whilst the side extension would add bulk to the host dwelling, it would nevertheless be subordinate to it and to the neighbouring dwelling at No 6. In addition though the side extension would be visible and would reduce the gap between the host building and No 6, an appreciable gap would remain and there would be no loss of garden views given that the existing view is of the rear elevations of properties on Springfield Road.
7. The rear dormer would be modest in size and scale and due to its position at the rear of the host building and relative to surrounding development it would not be prominent or visible other than from the rear of surrounding properties. Although it has a horizontal emphasis and would have side hung casements, given its position within the roof and given the horizontal proportions of the host building, I do not consider that it would be harmful to either the host building or the CA. At my visit I noted rear dormers of similar proportions visible from Loudoun Road.
8. Taking the above matters into consideration, I conclude that the proposal would preserve the character and appearance of the CA in accordance with the expectations of section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. For the same reasons it would also accord with the development plan and in particular policies S25 and S28 of the Westminster City Plan, policies DES 1, DES 5, DES 6 and DES 9 of the City of Westminster Unitary Development Plan (UDP) and to guidance contained within paragraphs 10.108 to 10.128 of the UDP and within the Council's Supplementary Planning

Guidance Development and Demolition in Conservation Areas. These policies and this guidance seek, amongst other things, to ensure that development is of the highest standard of design and that it conserves heritage assets including conservation areas.

Conditions

9. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. I have imposed a condition specifying the relevant plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring the extension and dormer to be constructed from materials to match the existing building. This is having regard to the sites location in a conservation area and in order to protect the character and appearance of the host building and the CA.

Conclusion

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

Beverley Wilders

INSPECTOR