



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 6 August 2019

by Alison Scott BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 October 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/18/3217782

2nd Floor Flat, 21 Glenloch Road, London NW3 4DJ

- 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 Oliver Boundy against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2018/1899/P, dated 14 May 2018, was refused by notice dated 30 October 2018.
 - The development proposed is a rear second floor dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is part of a terrace of dwellings in the leafy residential area of Belsize Park. The dwelling is one of three flats within a two-storey house at 21 Glenloch Road backing onto the rear gardens and elevations of other dwellings on Glenmore Road. The application site is located within Belsize Park Conservation Area and is a suburb with fine examples of imposing Italianate villas, mews developments and terraced houses. The adopted *Conservation Area Statement Belsize Park* 2003 acknowledges the different historical periods Belsize Park has evolved through using specific character areas to identify each.
4. The appeal site is located within the character area of Glenloch recognised for its distinctive Edwardian terraced housing with elevations of strong rhythm that gives consistency to the terrace, making a positive contribution to the significance of the heritage asset.
5. I have been made aware of the *Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement* that sets out that development will only be permitted within conservation areas where it preserves the character and appearance of the conservation area. It goes on to require development to respect existing features such as roof lines. The *Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) Design* 2019 reinforces development in conservation areas to preserve, and where possible enhance, the character and appearance of the area. The Council's, *Altering and extending your home* March 2019 CPG further sets out what is broadly acceptable design for rear dormers.

6. It is apparent that the existing rear roof slope is largely unspoilt save for the insertion of roof lights, and I am aware of other rear dormers in close proximity to the site although no planning history of such has been provided, nor do I consider they are directly comparable to the appeal site given the size of the proposed dormer. This would have a projection from the roof slope of around 3.7m and is nearly the full width of the roof plane as it is set in from one side only. As it would be positioned close to the eaves level of the roof, in my judgement, its position close to the eaves level of the roof would emphasises its height. Overall, due to its scale, the dormer would appear disproportionate to the existing roof structure thus contributing to it appearing unduly large and prominent when viewed in its context. The use of brick sides to the dormer would further emphasise its unsympathetic design.
7. The appellant agrees to the use of timber framed windows as opposed to white upvc as originally detailed within their planning submission to the Council. In my view, the non-traditional design of windows bears no relationship to the windows below and therefore does not respect the original dwelling, further harming its character.
8. My assessment of the dormer is that it would be contrary to both the *Conservation Area Statement* and *Design CPD's*, and further contrary to policy D1 and D2 of the adopted 2017 *London Borough of Camden Local Plan* that aims to secure high quality design by respecting local context and character, preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would have a harmful impact on the character of the host dwelling and in turn would have a negative effect on the significance of a designated heritage asset and would result in "less than substantial" harm in the words of the National Planning Policy Framework. No public benefits have been put forward to weigh against this harm.
9. Overall the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposed development would not conserve the heritage asset in a manner appropriate to its significance in line with one of the core planning principles of the Framework. Therefore, for the reasons given, the development is unacceptable and the appeal should not succeed.

Conclusion

10. For the reasons above, the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR