
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 November 2014

by Clive Tokley MRTTP

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

Decision date: 10 November 2014

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/14/2225804
73 Parkhill Road, London, NW3 2XY

- 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 Ms Sevgi Akdeniz against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2014/2240/P was refused by notice dated 15 July 2014.
 - The development proposed is a side and rear dormer enlargement and internal alterations to the house.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Parkhill Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

3. The CA comprises the mixed use commercial frontage of Haverstock Hill and the residential area to the north east. The majority of the area was developed in the mid to late C19 but the appeal property lies within a later development at the northern end of the CA.
4. The *Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal* of July 2011 refers to a development of 1930s "semi-detached" houses along Garnett Road and the ends of Lawn Road, Upper Park Road and Parkhill Road. In reality this development comprises short terraces of hipped-roof two-storey dwellings with limited accommodation in the roof space lit by small dormer windows. The original dormers can be seen in the roof planes at the ends of the buildings, facing to the side, and in the front-facing roof planes of the mid terrace houses. The width of the dormers is about 2.5 times their height and these proportions reflect the horizontal emphasis of the houses.
5. The appeal property lies at the southern end of a terrace of five dwellings fronting Parkhill Road. It forms the southernmost part of the 1930s development and lies immediately to the north of a five-storey flat development. As result of the space between No 73 and the flats, and its position closer to the road, much of the flank wall and the hipped roof of the dwelling are in view when approached from the south. This enables the original dormer window in the hip end to be seen in combination with the three

similar dormers in the houses to north that front the road. I saw that the other terraces nearby had been altered at roof level with the insertion of larger dormers; however with the exception of the re-tiling of No 75 the elevations of the front and ends of the terrace containing the appeal property appear to be mostly unchanged and the original character has been retained.

6. The proposed side dormer would be narrower and taller than the existing. Its almost square elevation would not reflect the horizontal emphasis of the terrace and as a result of its height and projection from the roof plane it would be much bulkier than the existing dormer. My attention has been drawn to other larger dormers within the area, including that at No 83 which is at the end of the adjacent terrace to the north. However the proposal would be more prominent than that at No 83 and would materially detract from the largely unchanged roof-scape of the terrace when seen from the street.
7. A number of the houses in the 1930's development have rear dormers, some of which dominate their roof planes. The rear of the terrace containing the appeal property contains a single dormer window (At No 79) and No 75 has roof lights in its rear roof plane. The proposed rear dormer would be a tall narrow addition that would be at odds with the design and proportions of the terrace. It would not be as visually intrusive as the side dormer but it would nevertheless be seen from the Upper Park Road entrance to the adjacent flats and the footpath that links Upper Park Road and Parkhill Road. Although narrow its projection from the roof would result in the dormer appearing as a bulky and ungainly addition.
8. The appellant draws attention to the Council's acceptance that the proposal would not conflict with its general guidance as regards dormer windows (in *Camden Planning Guidance -Design* (CPG) adopted in September 2013); however that guidance indicates that for properties in conservation areas reference should also be made to the relevant conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans. Policies cannot foresee all eventualities and the CA appraisal indicates that the individual merits of each proposal for dormer windows will be considered in relation to their impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. The appraisal indicates that particular care is needed to ensure sensitive and unobtrusive design to visible roof slopes.
9. The appellant refers to a number of inaccuracies in the Council officer report but these are not material to my determination of the appeal. The proposed dormers would be obtrusive elements within publicly visible roof slopes and as a result of their size and design the proposed dormers would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the CA. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policy CS14 of the *Camden Core Strategy* and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Council's *Development Policies* which in combination seek to ensure that all development is well designed and conserves heritage assets within the Borough.
10. The harm to the heritage asset (the CA) is "less than substantial" as indicated by the National Planning Policy Framework; however I have not identified any public benefits that would be sufficient to outweigh that harm. I have noted the appellant's wish to make better use of the accommodation at roof level but this personal objective does not outweigh the harm that would be caused to the character and appearance of the CA.

Conclusion

11. Taking account of all matters I have concluded that the proposal would unacceptably detract from the character and appearance of the Parkhill Conservation Area and that the appeal should not succeed.

Clive Tokley

INSPECTOR