



Appeal Decision

Accompanied site visit made on 3 October 2011

by P E Dobsen MA (Oxon) DipTP MRTPI FRGS

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

Decision date: 11 October 2011

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/11/2154582
26 Denning Road, London NW3 1SU

- 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 Dome Assets Ltd. against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application (Ref 2010/6291/P), dated 18 November 2010, was refused by notice dated 19 January 2011.
 - The development proposed is "extension to existing rear dormer window and construction of new dormer window to front elevation".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue, in the light of the relevant planning policies, is the effect of the proposed enlarged rear dormer window on the appearance of the building, and that of the Hampstead Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a 4 storey, brick-built terraced dwelling house located about half way along the south side of Denning Road, which is within the extensive Hampstead CA. This has a rear garden which backs onto generally similar terraced properties in Carlingford Road, from which the rear of the appeal site can clearly be seen.
4. The Council has no objection to the principle of inserting a new dormer window into the front roof elevation, nor to the details of its proposed design, and I agree with that. However, it refused the proposed enlarged rear dormer - which would help to light a third (top) floor bedroom - on the grounds that it would appear as an excessively large, over-bulky and incongruous addition at roof level, and thereby harmful to the appearance of the CA.
5. The precise dimensions and other details of the 2 proposed dormer windows are set out in the Council's officers' report on the application, and need not be repeated here. The appellants point out that there are numerous dormer windows at various addresses in Denning Road, and in adjacent streets, both at the front and the rear. During my site visit, I was able to view several of them, and I note that they exhibit considerable variety in their age, dimensions, and in the details of their design.

6. Acknowledging this, the Council says that these existing dormer windows were generally permitted under the terms of previous planning policies. The development plan currently comprises the Camden Local Development Framework (LDF) Core Strategy and Development Policies documents (adopted 2010), which contain policies to control the design of all new development, including that proposed in CAs. These are supplemented by the Camden Planning Guidance, Design (April 2011) which merits due weight in this appeal, and by the advice in the Hampstead CA statement (2002).
7. I agree with the Council that the proposed rear dormer would not represent good design, as required by LDF policies and the Council's design guidance. This is because it would appear disproportionately large and bulky in relation to the profile and dimensions of the pitched roof, and wholly out of scale with it. It would also appear poorly related to the fenestration of the lower storeys of the building. Although there are equally incongruous roof additions in the near vicinity, both in Denning Road and in Carlingford Road, I consider that for these reasons it would tend to harm the appearance of the building, and of this part of the CA. This would be contrary to the relevant policies in the development plan and to the Council's design guidance, and is the reason why the appeal must fail.
8. I have considered the other points mentioned in the appellants' representations, and in those from interested persons, but they do not alter or outweigh my conclusions on the main town planning issue in the appeal.

Paul Dobsen

INSPECTOR