



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 April 2023

by P D Sedgwick BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 10th May 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/22/3311706

16 Leighton Place, Camden, London, NW5 2QL

- 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 Ed Dumas against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2022/1006/P, dated 11 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 20 October 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of front dormer, alterations to materials on the rear dormer, rear elevation alterations and modest non-material internal alterations.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the building and surrounding area.

Reasons

3. Leighton Place is an L shaped cul-de-sac with a mix of residential and industrial and commercial buildings and a college. The residential component comprises a mix of flats in some of the former industrial units and 2 storey terraced and semi-detached houses. The appeal site is the end house in a terrace of 5 houses joined to a 3 storey building that appeared to be converted into flats.
4. Section 2.2.1 of the Home Improvements Camden Planning Guidance (2021) advises that front dormers can have a harmful visual impact but are likely to be acceptable where they are part of the existing character, illustrated by a terrace of houses where the majority had dormers. The neighbouring house, No 14, is the only house within the terrace with a front dormer. As such, it does not define the character of the terrace. The proposed dormer would dominate the roof, appear out of keeping with other houses within the terrace and add to the incongruity of the neighbouring dormer, thus harming the appearance of the street scene.
5. I note that there are front dormers on a pair of semi-detached houses at the end of the cul-de-sac. However, these are separated from other houses by 3 storey former industrial buildings and are partially screened by trees. They therefore appear discrete from, and share a different design to, the appeal property and its neighbours and as such do not contribute to their character and context. The appellant has also referred to other dormers within the street. I

saw side dormers on the roof of 2 of the former industrial buildings including the building adjoining the appeal site. Whilst they were visible from the street, they were part of a distinctly different roofscape from the appeal site. Apart from their industrial design, the roof ridges on the buildings are a storey higher than the appeal property, perpendicular to the street rather than parallel to it, and set behind brick parapets and gable ends. As such the dormers on those buildings are not comparable to the proposed development.

6. Overall, I conclude that the proposed front dormer would harm the appearance of the appeal property and that of the terrace of which it is part and thus the proposal conflicts with Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan (2017) and Policy D3 of the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan (2016) which require high quality development that complements local character.

Other Matter

7. I have had regard to other matters raised by the appellant including the lack of through access and limited pedestrian activity close to the site. However, these do not outweigh the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

8. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

P D Sedgwick

INSPECTOR