



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 November 2010

by Anthony Lyman BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 December 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/10/2133404

20 Eton Garages, Lambolle Place, London, NW3 4PE

- 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 Martin Raybould against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2010/1434/P, dated 10 March 2010, was refused by notice dated 6 May 2010.
 - The development proposed is to alter part of existing attic and slate roof for two new dormers.
-

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. Eton Garages comprises mews type buildings many of which have commercial use on the ground floor with residential accommodation above. The end of terrace appeal property occupies the first floor and the attic level under a pitched roof which has velux type windows in each slope. The proposal is to replace the roof lights on the elevation fronting Eton Garages with two flat roofed dormer windows.
4. Each dormer would be about 2.7m wide and approximately 1.5m high. In terms of the distances from the eaves, the ridge and side elevations, each dormer would largely accord with the Council's Supplementary Planning Document – *Camden Planning Guidance* (SPD). However, the SPD also advises that dormer windows should relate to the facade below in terms of number, form, scale and pane size and should generally align with windows on lower floors. The SPD further advocates that the overall height and width of the dormers should be no greater than the windows below.
5. In this case, the proposed dormers would be considerably wider than the appeal property's first floor windows and would have a discordant horizontal emphasis. I noted on my site visit that many properties in the mews have dormer windows and that a few buildings have dormers of a similar scale to the appeal proposal. However, according to the Council, the existing larger dormers in the mews appear to have been erected in the eighties and nineties,

prior to the adoption of the SPD and the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

6. Given their excessive scale, mass and overall design, the proposed dormers would be unsympathetic additions which would dominate the facade of the building and cause significant harm to its appearance. They would also appear prominent and incongruous in the street scene, contrary to the objectives of Policies B1 and B3 of the UDP. The proposed dormers would, therefore, fail to preserve or enhance the appearance of the Conservation Area, contrary to Policy B7 of the UDP.
7. For the reasons given and having had regard to all other matters raised, I dismiss the appeal.

Anthony Lyman

INSPECTOR