
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 August 2015

by Tim Wood BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 13/08/2015

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/15/3024038

22 Ferncroft Avenue, London NW3 7PE

- 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 Roger Torns against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2014/7401/P, dated 20 November 2014, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2015.
 - The development proposed is a new dormer window to the attic at the rear of the property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a new dormer window to the attic at the rear of the property at 22 Ferncroft Avenue, London NW3 7PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 2014/7401/P, dated 20 November 2014, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the extension hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
 - 3) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 174D-S-01; 174D-S-02; 174D-S-03; 174D-EX-RF 174D-EX-03; 174D-EE-01; 174D-EE-02; 174D-EE-03; 174D-ES-01; 174D-GA-RF; 174D-GA-03; 174D-GE-01; 174D-GE-02; 174D-GE-03; 174D-GS-01.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Reasons

3. The appeal relates to this handsome detached house, which contains elements of the Arts and Crafts style, which is located within the Redlington and Frogna Conservation Area. The house provides accommodation over 3 floors plus an approved basement and with a modest attic area. The existing second floor is partially served by dormer windows at the front and rear.

4. The rear elevation currently contains a gabled section and a rear roof slope containing a dormer window and above that roof-lights serving the attic. It is proposed to replace the roof-lights with a dormer. The proposal would be set to the side and above the existing dormer and would be smaller than it, although of a very similar design.
5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document '*Camden Planning Guidance – Design*' (CPG) sets out guidance for dormer extensions and includes that they should usually be sited at least 500mm from the sides and the ridge of the roof; it adds that materials will be important and that the rhythm of the façade will be a consideration.
6. The proposed dormer would have a hipped roof with a central ridge. Its highest part would be closer to the ridge than 500mm and the nearest point of one side would be closer than 500mm to the hip line where it abuts the adjacent part of the roof. Whilst these are matters which would not comply with the guidance, it should be noted that these refer to the closest points and due to the fact that the roof would be ridged and the existing hip line is angled, the great majority of the dormer would be greater than 500mm from these features.
7. I acknowledge that the proposed dormer would not follow the line of the fenestration on the lower floors; however, the rear elevation of this and neighbouring properties are visually busy, containing a number of differing elements and roof-slopes, rather than presenting an ordered and regular elevation. Adding to this the fact that the dormer would be smaller than the existing one at the lower level, leads me to conclude that the proposal would not appear out of place and would not lead to a cluttered or disorganised rear elevation. The appellant has drawn my attention to a number of other dormer windows at higher levels within the area and presented photographs of some. In this context, and taking account of the fact that it would only be seen from a very restricted area to the rear leads me to conclude that it would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Therefore, the proposal would not conflict with the aims of Policies CS5 and CS14 of the Core Strategy and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Development Policies.
8. In order to ensure a satisfactory appearance, it is necessary that the proposal is constructed of materials which match the existing house and I shall include a condition in this respect. For the sake of certainty and proper planning I shall also include a condition that requires the proposal to be constructed in accordance with the approved plans.
9. I have taken account of all other matters but find nothing which leads me to a different conclusion. As a consequence, the appeal is allowed.

S T Wood

INSPECTOR