



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 March 2010

by **Peter Fenwick BA(Hons) BPI MRTPI**

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

The Planning Inspectorate
4/11 Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372
email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:
30 April 2010

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/A/09/2112523

24 Narcissus Road, West Hampstead, London, NW6 1TH

- 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 Guy Coleman against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2009/1088/P, dated 17 February 2009, was refused by notice dated 8 June 2009.
- The development proposed is the erection of a roof extension including a Juliette balcony to the rear to create additional space for a first floor flat (Use Class C3).

Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

Main issue

2. I consider the main issue to be the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the appeal property and terrace.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a mid-terrace three storey property in two flats. At the rear is a three storey linked outrigger with a roof ridge lower than the main terrace ridge. The rear outriggers are common to the host terrace and the terrace to the rear. The rear garden of the appeal property, and those of nearby terraced properties, is modest in size.
4. Camden Planning Guidance 2006 (CPG) for roofs and terraces states that the guidance applies to all planning applications involving roof alterations and requires such alterations to retain the overall integrity of the roof form and be architecturally sympathetic. In my view the guidance applies to all roof alterations, including those at the rear of a property. The guidance in the CPG reflects the general design principles set out for new development, including alterations and extensions, in policies B1 and B3 of the Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 (UDP).
5. Whilst I accept that there are examples of larger roof dormers in the vicinity, I observed nearby examples of roof dormers that did not extend above the height of the outrigger roof ridge and were set in to the main terrace roof, thereby retaining subservience to the main property. Nonetheless, the majority of the nearby terraced properties have roofs which have not been altered by dormers and extensions.

6. The proposed rear dormer would extend the width of the roof and the greater length of the roof slope, cutting across the existing roof valley between the main roof and the outrigger. The flat roof of the proposed dormer would be just below the existing roof ridge and extend above the ridge of the rear outrigger with the vertical tile hung face sited just above the eaves. Notwithstanding the use of traditional matching materials, due to its height and width the proposal would appear incongruous and out of character with the terraced roof and would not relate to the existing building. In addition, the proposed juliette balcony together with the side windows would increase the perception of an additional floor at the rear, further increasing the visual harm to the appeal property and terrace.
7. The proposed development would be seen by nearby residents from their rear gardens and the rear windows of nearby dwellings. Whilst I acknowledge that the rear elevation cannot be viewed from public vantage points and that the dense urban form restricts views of the appeal site, that is no justification for development that would be out of keeping with and harmful to the appearance of the appeal property. Although the property is not listed or in a conservation area, good design which complements its surroundings is nonetheless an important objective in the planning process.
8. I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the appeal property and host terrace. As such it is contrary to policies B1 and B3 in the UDP and guidance in the CPG which seek to ensure new development respects the setting and architectural integrity of the existing building and surrounding area.

Other matters

9. The Council have indicated that a number of nearby full width roof dormers did not require planning permission as they benefited from permitted development rights. Nevertheless, I have no knowledge of which other properties in the area would benefit from these permitted development rights, and which house owners in the area would seek to extend their houses in a similar way to the appeal proposal. Although planning permission has been granted for a dormer roof extension at No 13 Narcissus Road, the Council states this is smaller than the appeal proposal. In any event each appeal falls to be considered on its own merits. I also acknowledge the appellant's wish to seek a limited amount of additional space. Nonetheless, these matters do not overcome the harm that I have identified.

Conclusion

10. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Peter Fenwick

INSPECTOR