
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 March 2015

by J Dowling BA(Hons) M.Phil MRTPI

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

Decision date: 9 April 2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/15/3002952
93 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 Mrs Kalpana Murthy against the decision of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2014/4828/P was refused by notice dated 18 November 2014.
 - The development proposed is erection of rear dormer, enlargement of side dormer and instillation of front roof light.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host property and the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

3. The Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area forms part of the suburb of Belsize it is defined by the busy urban nature of Haverstock Hill and the quiet residential streets that branch off from it. It contains an eclectic mix of housing types ranging from Victorian Italianate villas to the landmark Isokon building. No 93 Parkhill Road is located within a small group of two storey 1930's terraces which are clustered at the end of Parkhill Road, Upper Park Road and along Garnett Road. This group of properties are two storey in height with a number of key features including dormer windows and prominent suntrap crittall style windows. Although some of the properties have been unsympathetically altered, many retain original features providing a consistency of appearance. These features contribute positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole and its significance as a designated heritage asset.
4. The Council has indicated that their concern relates to the side and rear dormer. The other elements of the scheme they consider acceptable. Having visited the site I note that the proposed rooflight in the front roofslope would replicate a similar rooflight at the opposite end of the block and therefore agree with the Council and consider that this element of the scheme would not adversely impact on the character and appearance of the existing building or the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.

5. No 93 is the end unit of a terrace of six properties. Each of the inner houses within the terrace has a small, wide flat roofed dormer within the front roofslope. The end units, Nos 83 and 93, have dormers of a similar size and design in the hipped side roofslope. This type of low, wide dormer is a feature of this group of properties and although a number on the adjoining properties in Garrett Road and Upper Park Road have been altered those in the two blocks on Parkhill Road are consistent in their design and proportions.
6. The appeal proposal would extend and alter the existing low, wide side dormer to create a taller narrower dormer which would occupy a greater proportion of the roofslope. Consequently I consider that the proposed dormer would be out of character with the host building, the side dormer at No 83 and the front dormers on the other four houses within this block and as a result the proposal would erode the symmetry of the terrace of houses of which No 93 forms part.
7. Furthermore, the impact of the proposed changes would be exacerbated by the corner location of No 93 which means that there are clear views of the front, side and rear roofslope from the surrounding roads. As a result the changes to the side dormer would be visually prominent which given that they are out of character with the host property would harm the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area.
8. I note from my site visit that the design and proportions of rear dormers on surrounding properties is much more varied. However, while I recognise that normally with rear dormers the impact of the change would effect the less sensitive back of the property, due to the fact that the building line of this block projects forward of the front elevation of the Garnett Road properties and its corner location there are clear views of the rear roofslope from the adjoining road. Consequently, I consider that due to its size and design the proposed rear dormer would be a highly visible incongruous feature out of character with the host and adjoining buildings.
9. For these reasons I consider that the appeal proposal would cause a degree of harm. Where there is a harmful effect on the significance of a heritage asset which is less than substantial harm, which would apply in this case, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) requires the public benefit of the proposal to be weighed against the harm. However, no matters of public benefit have been identified which would outweigh the harm to the significance of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area.
10. Having come to the conclusions above, it follows that the proposal adversely effects the appearance of the host building and would therefore not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 (the Local Plan) and policies DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025 (the CDP) which seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Borough's conservation areas. This is consistent with the Framework's principles of conserving and enhancing the historic environment.
11. I note that the Appellant considers that the expired 2006 consent should be a material consideration. However, since the 2006 application the Council has adopted a new development plan, supplementary planning guidance and Conservation Area appraisal. Although I have not been provided with copies of the previous policies I would have only been able to afford them very little

weight as I am required to determine this appeal against the current adopted development plan policies and for the reasons outlined above I consider that the proposal is not in accordance with policies CS14 of the Core Strategy and policies DP24 and DP25 of the CDP.

12. The Appellant has made reference to the precedent of other dormers within the area, in particular the dormers on the adjoining property No 1 Garnett Road. However, whilst I note from my site visit that there are a variety of different designs of dormers as I have outlined above the side dormers within this and the adjoining block that faces Parkhill Road, unlike the block on Garnett Road, are consistent in their design and remain relatively unaltered. As a result I consider that the proposed alterations to the side dormer would be out of character and would adversely effect the character and appearance of this terrace of properties and the Conservation Area. Furthermore, due to the exposed nature of the rear roofslope, a dormer of the size and proportions proposed would be visually prominent and out of character. This approach is reflected in paragraph 24.13 of the CDP which advocates that past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations or extensions.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all other matters raised, this appeal is dismissed.

Jo Dowling

INSPECTOR