
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 August 2016

by Robert Parker BSc (Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

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

Decision date: 07 September 2016

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/16/3152159

11 Chalcot Road, Camden, London NW1 8LH

- 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 Melanie Salmon against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref 2016/0940/P, dated 22 February 2016, was refused by notice dated 27 April 2016.
 - The development proposed is dormer extensions to roof.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. There was nobody present at the appeal address at the time of my site visit. However, I was able to carry out my assessment from public land without being granted access to the property itself.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is whether the proposal would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The Primrose Hill Conservation Area is residential in character and its significance as a heritage asset is derived from its formal layout of Victorian terraces. These are predominantly three storeys in height with the roofs hidden from view behind a horizontal parapet.
 5. No 11 Chalcot Road is a typical mid-terrace dwelling. The property has an existing roof extension which sits well back from the front elevation and with a mansard at the rear. The design, which is similar in concept to other extensions in the same row, is largely successful in ensuring that the roof storey is subordinate to the host building and recessive in the street scene.
 6. The proposal is to bring forward the front plane of the roof extension to a position just behind the existing parapet. The resultant structure would be highly visible from the street – significantly more so than other extensions in the terrace which are generally set back in line with the chimney stack.
-

7. In my judgement, the scale and prominence of the dormer would be detrimental to the character of the building and it would disrupt the unity of the terrace as a whole. The harm to the street scene would be compounded by the proposed fenestration which would fail to respect the width and vertical proportions of the traditional sash windows below.
8. At the rear of the property the existing mansard would be replaced, with the face of the new dormer being built directly off the parapet wall. The massing of the extension would no longer be subservient to the host building and as a consequence it would appear visually discordant, particularly in views from Egbert Street.
9. Relevant design guidance is set out in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement (2001). Paragraph PH18 of this document warns that roof extensions and alterations which change the shape and form of the roof can have a harmful impact on the Conservation Area. It states that such works are unlikely to be acceptable where it would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building.
10. Detailed advice within Paragraph PH21 states that, where acceptable, roof extensions should be significantly set back from the street elevation in order to minimise views. To the rear, it advises that existing parapets should be retained and the rear slope of the extension should rise from behind the parapet wall, and should be separated from the wall by a substantial gutter. Having regard to my reasoning set out above, I consider that the appeal scheme would fail to comply with this guidance.
11. The appellant justifies the proposal by reference to the roof extensions at No 13 Chalcot Road. However, that development is not directly comparable as it has two individual vertically proportioned dormers to the front elevation and a sloping mansard on all sides. The appeal scheme would have none of these characteristics. More significantly, the extensions to No 13 pre-date current development plan policy and conservation area guidance. For this reason alone they should not be seen as setting a precedent for unsympathetic roof additions.
12. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. As such, it would conflict with Policy CS14 of the Camden Core Strategy 2010-2025 and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Camden Development Policies 2010-2025. These policies jointly seek high quality design that respects local context and character, and conserves Camden's heritage.
13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Robert Parker

INSPECTOR