

Appeal under S.78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990

On Behalf of:

## **Trevellyan Developments Ltd.**

In respect of:

**Installation of 1 x front dormer window and 1 x rear dormer extension to provide habitable accommodation within the roof for the first floor flat.**

Site:

**Flat C, 9 Medley Road, London, NW6 2HJ**

## **Statement of Case**

London Borough of Camden reference: 2017/5485/P

Prepared by:

Copesticks Ltd.  
39 Tudor Hill  
Sutton Coldfield  
B73 6BE

March 2018

# Contents

1	Introduction	Page 3
2	Site and Surroundings	Page 4
3	Planning History	Page 5
4	Policy Context	Page 8
5	Appellant's Case	Page 15
6	Conclusions	Page 17

Appendix 1	-	5 Medley Road (2007/1270/P) Officer's Report
Appendix 2	-	12B Medley Road Appeal Decision (APP/X5210/A/01/1064412)
Appendix 3	-	12B Medley Road Plans
Appendix 4	-	Letter from Nick Collins (Heritage Expert)

-

# 1 Introduction

1.1 Copesticks Ltd. has been instructed by Trevelyan Developments Ltd to submit this appeal against the refusal of planning permission, by the London Borough of Camden.

## The Development and Application Context

1.2 The description of the proposed development is:

*Installation of 1 x front dormer window and 1 x rear dormer extension to provide habitable accommodation within the roof for the first floor flat.*

1.3 The planning application (reference 2017/5485/P) was registered on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2017 and public consultation was carried out until 17<sup>th</sup> November 2017. No comments were received from neighbours.

1.4 Planning application was refused on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2017. The single reason for refusal was:

*The proposed dormer extension, by reason of scale, bulk, detailed design and location on a row of terrace properties with an otherwise unimpaired roofline, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the group of properties in the terrace of which it forms a part, contrary to Policy D1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.*

1.5 The reason for refusal is considered to be imprecise; it refers to a single dormer, where the proposal was for multiple dormers. The reason for refusal is also considered to be unjustified and unsound, as will be discussed further below.

## 2 Site and Surroundings

2.1 Medley Road is a small cul-de-sac off Iverson Road. The eastern side of which is a terrace of 7 three storey properties, set back from the road with small front gardens. The final three properties on the street do not directly front the road, as there is no through access, instead fronting a paved area adjacent to a garage at the end of the road. Parking in Medley Road is via residents permit. Medley Road also contains a number of mature trees on both sides of the road.

2.2 The western side of the street comprises a terrace of four properties, which appear in height as being two storey, as the ground floor is at basement level therefore being much lower in height than the opposite side of the road. Two of the properties within this terrace have large rear extensions.

2.3 There is also a further larger building adjoining 9 Medley Road and set forward of the building line, This property is much larger and more prominent than its neighbours appearing to be a further storey greater in height. It also contains a pedestrian access from the street through to Aerynn House (flats). There is also a single storey flat roof garage at the end of the road which adjoins this building.

2.4 9 Medley Road, like the adjoining properties is set back from the road with access via steps to the ground floor entrance and down to the basement flat. The rear of the property faces on to the tall blank gable of Aerynn House.

2.5 From Medley Road, it is possible to see the wide range of rear extensions, including dormer roof extensions to properties on Iverson Road, many of which also have front dormer extensions too.

2.6 At the end of the road (directly to the south is the overground line between Barking and Gospel Oak (the closest stations being West Hampstead to the east, with Brondesbury to the South –West. Beyond the railway line is Heritage Lane (West Hampstead Square) which contains numerous apartment blocks. There is also the Thameslink Station further along Iverson Road as you head to West End Lane. The Appeal site is highly accessible by public transport and sustainably located.

2.7 The wider area is primarily residential in nature, there is a children's play area on Iverson Road to the south west of the site, and a number of office buildings to the north east. Iverson Road contains a variety of residential styles including modern apartment blocks and traditional Victorian terraced properties .

2.8 Close to the junction of Medley Road with Iverson Road, is the junction of Iverson Road with Maygrove Road, directly to the north of the site (as the crow flies) is Liddell Road which contains an Industrial Estate, comprising of a variety of units which back onto the Thameslink Railway Line.

### 3 Planning History

3.1 It is appreciated that each application should be determined on its own merits, however, it is considered that Planning Authorities need to be consistent in their approach to development, to give Applicants and their professional advisers some confidence that features that they see in the area and wish to incorporate into their development have a reasonable chance of being approved. This is what enables design to be innovative and individual, rather than dogmatic adherence to a specific set of standards, or monotonous pastiche.

3.2 There are many examples of planning permission having been granted by the Authority for very similar proposals to that the subject of the Appeal. The following are just a few examples in the area

3.3 5 Medley Road (2007/1270/P) – Installation of two rooflights in front roof slope and erection of dormer window in rear roof slope in connection with loft conversion to provide additional floorspace to existing second floor flat. Planning permission granted 17/05/2007. 5 Medley Road is opposite the Appeal site.

3.4 The Officer's report is attached at **Appendix 1**, in the report, the Officer states:

*The proposal works are considered to be respectful of the character and appearance of the building, preserve the character and appearance of the streetscene, and will be unobtrusive in the surrounds and in no way detrimental to the amenity of surrounding properties. The works are considered to have appropriate regard for relevant policies of the Replacement UDP.*

3.5 The proposal was also found to be consistent with the requirements of Figure 3 of Section 41 (Roofs and terraces) of the CPG, being set up 0.5m from the rear eaves line, the ridge and from either side boundary.

3.6 As is the case with the Appeal site, the rear 5 Medley Road is visible from the railway line and the private amenity space of other properties.

3.7 12B Medley Road (PWX0003109) – Erection of front and rear dormers to provide an additional habitable room for the existing first floor flat. Planning permission refused 13/03/2001; Appeal allowed 29/08/2001; the appeal reference is APP/X5210/A/01/1064412.

3.8 The Inspector's decision letter is attached at **Appendix 2**, which is clearly an objective and reasonable assessment of the proposal, which very closely resembled the Appeal proposal.

3.9 12 Medley Road lies in the same terrace as the Appeal site and the proposals included an almost identical round headed front dormer window and a rear dormer with a small balcony area, the plans are attached at **Appendix 3**. The rear dormer is set in from the sides, set up from the eaves and only very slightly down from the ridge, just below the ridge tiles.

3.10 In the decision letter, with regard to the round headed front dormer, the Inspector states:

*“...I agree with the Council’s view that the modest size and design of these examples compliments the appearance of the main elevation of the terraces with their arched doorways and decorative bay windows.”*

Also:

*“...in this case the proposal is set well back from the eaves and below the line of the ridge. Whilst I accept that the window would be relatively wide in relation to the roof, it would have a one metre verge on each side of the roof which in my opinion would be sufficient separation to respect the integrity of the roof and preserve the strong visual rhythm of the party wall upstands and chimneys.”*

Further that:

*“ Whilst the view from the railway is an important consideration, these are not listed buildings and I am satisfied that the overall quality of the design would not make it appear incongruous or out of place from these more distant views..... I consider the proposed set back would preserve the character, shape and line of the original roof of the terrace. I have therefore concluded that the proposed loft conversion would not be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building, or to the terrace.*

3.11 The context has changed in some respects since the appeal decision, but in one pertinent respect, it has not changed, the building remains unlisted and is not located within a Conservation Area. However, in 2005 a 4-storey block of apartments was approved (2005/3652/P) and subsequently built to the rear of the Appeal site, the flank wall of the apartments being approximately 15m from the rear of No.9 Medley Road; the Appellant would very strongly contend that the 4-storey apartment block has had a far more significant impact on views of the rear of 9 Medley Road, including the roof slope, than the proposed dormer would, particularly from the views cited by the Authority as being material to the decision, such as the view from the railway line.

3.12 In this regard, it must also be noted that views of the front of 9 Medley Road, including the roof slope from the principal public viewpoint, Iverson Road and Medley Road, are very limited, but where they exist, the property and the roof are utterly dominated by the view of the new build apartment blocks on Heritage Lane to the south of the site. The question has to be asked, if the views of the roof are so important as to refuse a tiny front dormer extension of a style that is well- established and accepted and widespread in the area, why was it not taken into consideration in the Heritage Lane application? The Appellant considers the reason for refusal to be entirely unreasonable and unjustified.

3.13 Other examples of recent planning history in the immediate area, where dormer windows have been approved without question include:

- 99 Iverson Road (2012/4837/P) - Installation of dormer window on rear roofslope. Permission Granted 13/11/2012;

- Flat 8 148 Iverson Road (2011/2808/P) - Erection of a dormer roof extension to rear roofslope and two rooflights to front roofslope to residential flat (Class C3). Permission Granted 04/08/2011;
- Flat B, 156 Iverson Road (2017/6829/P) - Installation of rear dormer window and installation of 2 x roof lights to front and 1x roof light to rear. Permission granted 05/02/2018. This dormer will be clearly visible from the rear of 9 Medley Road and be seen in the same context as No.9 in long range views that were considered material to the determination.
- Flat 2nd Floor 139 Iverson Road (2016/5687/P) Erection of a rear dormer extension with the installation of two rooflights to the front roof slope of residential flat. Permission granted 02/12/2016;

3.14 The above recent examples demonstrate that the Authority has elsewhere embraced proposals similar and almost identical to Appeal development in the immediate area. The Appellant considers that this approach, allowing well-designed individual tastes to add diversity to the street scene is the correct approach to development management and that an overly prescriptive approach should be avoided, where it is not warranted, i.e. outside a Conservation Area.

## 4 Policy Context

4.1 The planning policy context and material policy considerations comprise the National Planning Policy Framework, also, the London Borough of Camden Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Guidance.

### National Planning Policy Framework

4.2 At paragraph 6, the NPPF sums up the purpose of the planning system:

*“to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development...”*

4.3 Paragraph 7 of the NPPF then goes on to set out the three dimensions that the planning system must contribute towards sustainable development; these being economic, social and environmental roles.

4.4 The development would contribute to the economic role of sustainable development, through investment and construction.

4.5 In terms of the social role, the proposed works will result in a development that meets the needs of the owners and occupiers and contributing overall to the housing stock of the City.

4.6 The environmental role of sustainable development is defined as:

*“Contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment....”*

4.7 The proposed development would not conflict with this aim; the proposed dormer windows would protect the character of the built environment, whilst changing it nominally. The proposal essentially complies with design guidance and policy in all respects except that it lies in a very short terrace that has no dormers already. As has been discussed previously and will be further examined below, it is considered that the policy has been misinterpreted and unreasonable level of protection is offered to an aspect of no material value.

4.8 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF confirms that planning applications should be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. Paragraph 13 confirms that the NPPF is itself a material consideration. Paragraph 14 of the NPPF goes on to state:

*“At the heart of the National Planning policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking...”*

*For decision-taking this means:*



*Approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay...”*

4.9 Paragraph 56 of the NPPF states the Government’s view that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and indivisible from good planning. Good design should contribute positively to making places better for people, emphasising both the social and environmental roles that planning and the development should have in delivering sustainable development.

4.10 Paragraph 58 of the NPPF relates to design and states that planning decisions should aim to ensure that developments:

- *will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development;*
- *establish a strong sense of place, using streetscapes and buildings to create attractive and comfortable places to live, work and visit;*
- *respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation;*
- *create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion; and*
- *are visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.*

4.11 The Appeal proposals are exemplary in terms of conformity with this policy. The proposed dormer extensions, will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, it will create a comfortable place to live; they will respond to local character and represent modest innovation. The proposal represents good architecture, improving the appearance and making the best use of the building and respecting the character, layout and appearance of the surroundings.

4.12 Paragraph 59 of the NPPF relates to the formulation of policies rather than decision making, but its emphasis is clear. Good design needs to relate to the surroundings more widely than the existing building. Also, that unnecessary prescription in design matters should be avoided. It states:

*“Local planning authorities should consider using design codes where they could help deliver high quality outcomes. **However, design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.**”* (emphasis added)

4.13 The fact is that the Council's supplementary design guide is extremely prescriptive. Paragraph 60 of the NPPF goes on to state:

*“Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. It is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.”*

4.14 This paragraph of the NPPF is particularly pertinent, it rejects the Authorities approach in this case, which is prescribing that the existing *micro roofscape* is somehow sacrosanct. It is right to promote local distinctiveness, which the Appellant would contend the Appeal proposal would successfully achieve.

4.15 It is noted that alongside the 2017 Housing White Paper, the Government published the results of an earlier consultation on '*Upward Extensions in London*'. The responses were broadly positive and the Government has stated:

*It is clear that building up has a role to play in meeting the need for new homes across the country, not just in London, and the Housing White Paper proposes a package of measures to support building at higher densities and using land more efficiently for development. Our intention is therefore to take forward the policy option through the National Planning Policy Framework to support the delivery of additional homes by building up.*

4.16 The proposed development is considered to be consistent with this emerging government policy position of encouraging upwards extension development to make more efficient use of land and buildings available. The Appellant would like to reserve the right to comment further on this at a later date, if the revised NPPF is published during the appeal process.

## **London Borough of Camden Local Plan**

4.17 The Reason for refusal and Officer's report highlight the following policies.

4.18 Policy G1 Delivery and Location of Growth, this is an overarching strategic policy that sets out how the Authority will seek to deliver homes, jobs, infrastructure and facilities to meet Camden's identified needs. Most pertinently, the policy states:

*“The Council will deliver growth by securing high quality development and promoting the most efficient use of land and buildings in Camden by (inter alia):*

a. *supporting development that makes best use of its site, taking into account quality of design, its surroundings, sustainability, amenity, heritage, transport accessibility”*

4.19 The Local Plan recognises that making the most efficient use of land and buildings is essential; here the proposal represents good design, it is perfectly in keeping with the character of the area, it would have no impacts on amenities or heritage assets and the site has good transport accessibility. The proposal represents sustainable development in a highly accessible location.

4.20 Policy A1 relates to Managing the Impact of Development and seeks to protect amenities and ensure development has no unmitigated detrimental impact. The policy is referenced in the Officer’s report, which confirms that the proposal would have no unreasonable impact.

4.21 Policy D1 Design is perhaps the most pertinent Local Plan policy and is discussed in the Officer’s and referenced in the reason for refusal. The Policy states (inter alia):

*The Council will seek to secure high quality design in development. The Council will require that development:*

- a. respects local context and character;*
- b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 Heritage;*
- c. is sustainable in design and construction, incorporating best practice in resource management and climate change mitigation and adaptation;*
- d. is of sustainable and durable construction and adaptable to different activities and land uses;*
- e. comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character;*
- m. preserves strategic and local views;*
- n. for housing, provides a high standard of accommodation;*

4.22 The proposed development complies with this policy; the design of the dormer extensions respects the local context and character. The site is not a heritage asset and is not seen in the context of any heritage assets; to apply Conservation Area or Listed Building standards of scrutiny would be unreasonable. The construction methods will be sufficiently sustainable and durable and the loft conversion will ensure a greater level of insulation for the property as a whole. The materials used will complement the character of the existing building and the wider surroundings.

4.23 The proposed extensions will have no impact on strategic views and in reality none on local views, the dormer extensions would be modest additions to the roof and not interfere visually with the existing architectural roof features, the party wall upstands and chimneys.

4.24 The proposed development is considered to reasonably comply with the policies of the Local Plan.

## Camden Planning Guidance 1 - Design

4.25 CPG1 includes detailed guidance on roof extensions at chapter 5. Paragraph 5.8 states:

*A roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene (inter alia):*

- *Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design;*
- *Buildings already higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition;*
- *Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.*

4.26 The crux of the Authority's objection to the proposal is that the terrace of which the Appeal site forms a part does not currently include any such additions to the roof. This was also the case when permission was granted on Appeal for 12B Medley Road and for the terrace opposite when the Local Planning Authority granted consent at 5 Medley Road in 2007. However, the roofline is not unimpaired; No.8 Medley Road is an entire storey higher than the Appeal site and to the south, the party wall extends an additional storey above the ridge level of No.9. This provides the backdrop to which the dormers to No.9 would be viewed, albeit only very limited views would be afforded from public viewpoints.

4.27 This criterion within CPG1 is also caveated, and when taking the policy as a whole, the Appellant considers that the proposed works would not conflict. The guidance states:

*"A roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances **where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.**"*

4.28 In this instance, the Appellant strongly considers that there would not be an adverse affect on the skyline, the building, or the street scene. The form of the dormers accords with the guidance and has been designed to complement the character of the building and the surrounding area, furthermore, the streetscene will be almost unaffected by the proposals. There are extremely limited views of the roof of 9 Medley Road, and where there are glimpses, the roof is seen on the context of the side elevation of No.8 Medley road and the high rise apartments beyond. Therefore, in the absence of any adverse impact, the fact that the terrace of 4 dwellings does not include a dormer already is considered irrelevant. The latter part of the 'policy' is not engaged due to there not being any likelihood of material detrimental impact.

4.29 Paragraph 5.11 of the CPG1 provides guidelines for dormer extensions, to which the proposals broadly comply. The pitch of the existing roof is sufficient to allow adequate habitable space without creation of a disproportionately large dormer; the dormers would not cut through the roof ridge, nor appear to do so from the very restricted views of the site. The guidelines state that *usually a 500mm gap is required between the dormer and the ridge or hip to maintain this separation*. In this case a 500mm gap is not possible due to internal ceiling heights necessary, but the design does include distinct separation from the ridge and it is set well up from the eaves and in from the party wall upstands.

4.30 The guidance goes on to state that dormers should not be introduced where they would interrupt an unbroken roofscape, which with the side elevation of No.8., the party wall upstands and chimney features, is clearly not the case here.

4.31 The public facing front dormer has been designed to be subordinate to the windows below, it is positioned to correspond with the windows of the main elevation. The rear dormer is necessarily larger to provide decent accommodation within the loft conversion and is of a scale that has been widely accepted in the immediate and wider surroundings. The materials proposed for both would be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the area.

## **Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.**

4.32 The reason for refusal includes reference to the Neighbourhood Plan and specifically Policy 2: Design and Character. The policy requires all development to be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead. The policy requires development proposals, including extensions to be consistent with the form, function, structure and heritage of its context - including the scale, mass, orientation, pattern and grain of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces.

4.33 The Applicant would contend that the proposals do entirely respect the quality character of the surroundings and would assimilate well with the host building and the immediate context. The proposed development is consistent with the Neighbourhood Development Plan and it is noted that no objections were received from neighbours, or the body that prepared the NDP.

## 5 The Appellant's Case

5.1 From the Officer's report, it is clear that the objection to the front dormer is that it is a new addition to a terrace that currently includes no dormer features. The report acknowledges that in terms of design, it is satisfactory, stating that *its modest size and positioning above the lower floor bay window would ensure that it appears as a subordinate addition to the roof*. The Appellant considers that the refusal is unreasonable and unjustifiable.

5.2 The roofscape is not unbroken and the roofscape is not uninterrupted. A roofscape is vista that is wider than the 4 roofs of 9-12 Medley Road, which is the narrow interpretation that the Authority appears to be applying to this decision.

5.3 This terrace of roofs incorporates No.8, which cannot be conveniently ignored, when looking at the site and proposal objectively; it is a storey higher and creates a distinct break in the roofscape immediately adjacent to the proposed position of the dormers.

5.4 The high rise apartments on Heritage Lane loom over the site when viewing from Iverson Road, this is a significant obstruction that also cannot reasonably be ignored when considering what defines the roofscape of which the appeal site forms a part.

5.5 The Appellant would strongly contend that the front dormer window is well designed and wholly consistent with the policies identified in the reason for refusal.

5.6 The rear dormer is different in scale and context. The Authority does not consider it complies with the guidance of CPG1, The Appellant would disagree and would further assert that the rear dormer proposed certainly complies with the policies of the adopted Local Plan.

5.7 CPG1 is a guidance document, not a set of prescriptive formula by which all developments must comply; and if it were, which is arguably how the Authority is applying it in this case, it would be inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and thus fundamentally unsound.

5.8 The rear dormer is well designed to provide suitable living accommodation in the roof space, externally, it would be well contained within the roof slope and not an obtrusive feature, it is set well up from the eaves, there are reasonable gaps from the party wall upstands and it would be distinctly lower than the ridge.

5.9 The Appellant accepts that each application must be determined on its merits, but considers that the Local Authority is taking a completely inconsistent approach. When walking up Medley Road, or along Iverson Road it is notable that almost every single building has a dormer window, to the front or rear and in many cases both. Many of these will have been built as permitted development, but there is extensive planning history that

demonstrates that the Local Authority generally approves front and rear dormer windows in this area, including as recently as February 2018 in the case of 156 Iverson Road, which is visible from the rear of 9 Medley Road.

5.10 One of the key aspects of local and national planning policy that is particularly pertinent is the aim to make the best use of land and buildings available, which the application is seeking to do. The Government are now actively bringing forward measures to encourage extending buildings upwards to make more efficient use of existing developed land, the proposal is consistent with this emerging government policy.

5.11 The Appellant accepts that good design is indivisible from good planning, but considers that the Authority's design guide is being applied dogmatically, such that it is overly prescriptive. The Appellant also considers that the Authority has placed unreasonable emphasis on the fact that this short terrace of dwellings includes no dormer features and through the decision, implies the roofs should remain sacrosanct. There is alternative legislation that could be used to conserve these buildings should the Authority deem it necessary and the roofs to be of sufficient architectural merit, but this is simply not realistic, they are four standard Victorian terraced dwellings of reasonable quality, but they are not outstanding. It is considered unreasonable for the Authority to apply such stringent standards where there is no statutory protection, or reasonable prospect of there ever being.

5.12 Referring back to the appeal decision for 12B Medley Road, being the closest and most pertinent element of planning history; the Inspector, in the appeal decision was compelled to make a specific point that these are not Listed Buildings. The Appellant considers that the Council, in refusing the application, has placed too much emphasis on the character and appearance of the building and the terrace; applying Conservation Area, or Listed Building standards where they are unwarranted. As a result, the Appellant has sought advice from a Heritage Consultant to inform the Statement of Case. The advice letter from Nick Collins, a Member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation, is attached as **Appendix 4**. In his professional opinion, Mr. Collins considers that the proposals would appear modest within their context and entirely reasonable.

5.13 The heritage advisor also notes that:

*No.9 Medley Road cannot be said to form part of an unbroken terrace. Unlike the others on the west side of Medley Road, No.9 has a three storey square bay that sets it apart from the others to the north and to the south the building (whilst of a similar age) is of an entirely different proportion, with painted brick work and the passageway to the rear.*

5.14 The heritage expert concurs with the Appellant's view that this terrace does not have an unimpaired roofline, as is asserted in the reason for refusal. No.8 Medley Road cannot be overlooked and further, it is noted that the anomalous 3-storey square bay extends up to the eaves, making the roof distinct from 10-12 Medley Road. The Appellant considers that there is no merit in the Council's apparent view that this building or terrace is somehow exceptional and warrants special protection.



## 6 Conclusions

6.1 The Appellant would contend that the development accords with the Development Plan and that there are no material considerations of sufficient weight, individually, or cumulatively that would indicate that planning permission should not be granted.

6.2 The works, the subject of the Appeal are suitable and appropriate in their setting and well-proportioned and positioned in relation to the host building. The works broadly comply with the Authority's design guidance and are consistent with other decisions by the Authority and the Planning Inspectorate in the immediate and wider area.

6.3 The Appellant considers that the proposed development would constitute sustainable development.

6.4 At the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. It is the Appellants contention that in this case, given its merits, the presumption in favour should be engaged and the Appeal allowed.

6.5 It is firmly believed that the Authority's assessment of the context and in particular the roofscape is flawed and from that, the decision is unsound.

6.6 The design of the proposals are modest and good quality and entirely reasonable in the context, leading to improved and enlarged living accommodation, which will add to the housing stock of the city.

6.7 Given all of the above, it is respectfully requested that the appeal be allowed and planning permission granted for the proposed front and rear dormer windows.