



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 May 2016

by Timothy C King (BA Hons) MRTPI

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

Decision date: 16 May 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/16/3142782

1 Victoria Rise, Hilgrove Road, London NW6 4TH

- 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 Allan Taylor against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2015/3861/P, dated 8 July 2015, was refused by notice dated 6 November 2016.
 - The development proposed is '*To remove the existing hipped roof from the end of this dwelling and build up the gable wall. Construct new dormer extension in the rear of the existing roof to create additional bedroom. Two small roof lights to the front elevation roof.*'
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host dwelling and also the surrounding area.

Reasons

3. No 1 Victoria Rise lies at the western end of a 1980's building comprising seven four-storey townhouses. The building is hip-ended with central projecting gables and, although it has a lengthy frontage, when viewed from Hilgrove Road, it demonstrates a pleasing visual symmetry. The proposal would involve one of the building's flanks being altered to a gable-end in order to allow for the construction of a dormer extension to No 1's rear roofslope.
 4. At my site visit I observed rear dormer roof extensions at No 17 Hilgrove Road, the neighbouring dwelling westwards, on Belsize Road properties to the north and, more specifically, within the rear roofslope of the Victoria Rise building itself, extending Nos 4 and 5 thereto, respectively. The proposed dormer structure would be flat-roofed, set down slightly from the building's ridge height and up from the eaves.
 5. Policy DP24 of the Council's Local Development Framework Development Policies (LDFDP) requires for a high standard of design taking into account the character and proportions of the existing building where alterations and extensions are proposed. This aim is also reflected in Policy CS14 of the
-

Council's Local Development Framework Core Strategy (LDFCS). Given that the Victoria Rise building has already been extended at roof level and that the proposed dormer addition would, I consider, not be unduly prominent in its setting I do not consider that the dormer itself would be so bulky as to cause visual detriment. However, whilst I find this to be the case I consider the deciding factor in this appeal to be the proposed facilitative change so that one flank of the building would need to become gable-ended whilst the other end would remain hipped.

6. The appellant mentions that public views of the proposed gable would be limited and considers that the intended alteration would not have a significant or harmful impact upon the character or appearance of the building. I disagree, and consider that the resultant loss of symmetrical built form would distort the building's appearance and this create harm to the street scene. Neither do I consider that the appellant's representations referring to there being a wide variety of form, scale and design amongst local buildings should render the proposal acceptable. The overriding consequence of this proposal would be the loss of the Victoria Rise building's architectural cohesion and integrity.
7. I thereby conclude that the proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of both the host dwelling and the surrounding area, and this would conflict with the aims of LDFDP Policy DP24 and LDFCS Policy CS14.
8. Although the Council did not cite its Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Design CPG1' in the Reason for Refusal I note that the guidance comments that when considering roof alterations and extensions one of the main considerations should be the effect on the established townscape and architectural style. Given my findings as to there being consequential adverse impact this only reinforces my considerations.
9. For the above reasons, and having taken into account all matters raised, the appeal does not succeed.

Timothy C King

INSPECTOR