



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 September 2018

**by R Norman BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State**

**Decision date: 24<sup>th</sup> September 2018**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/18/3202983**

**37 Minster Road, London NW2 3SH**

- 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 Sarah Resch against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2017/5917/P, dated 20 October 2017, was refused by notice dated 29 March 2018.
  - The development proposed is the erection of single-storey ground floor level extension, conversion of a hip to gable, erection of two side dormers plus cladding to the rear facade.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matters

2. The new National Planning Policy Framework was published in July 2018 and both parties were given the opportunity to comment on the revised document.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the host building and the area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is located on Minster Road and comprises a detached, three-storey dwelling utilising the roof space, with associated driveway and rear garden. The immediate surroundings are characterised by predominantly residential properties. The proposed development would enlarge the existing roof and introduce a rear dormer window and two side dormers to provide additional accommodation in the roof space. It would also introduce timber cladding to the rear of the dwelling. A ground floor extension is proposed which would extend the existing kitchen. The Council have raised no concerns with the ground floor rear extension therefore my considerations have focused on the other elements of the proposal.
5. The appeal property has been subject to a previous rear extension. Whilst this extension has taken place, the rear elevation of the dwelling as extended retains its traditional character and materials. The proposed alteration to the roof and the introduction of the rear and side dormers would add a

- disproportionate and incongruous feature into the existing roofscape which would be visually dominant and out of keeping with the existing roofscapes in the immediate surroundings, which are largely unaltered.
6. I understand that the previous extensions to the property have resulted in an unsympathetic convergence at roof level, and that the proposal seeks to improve this. However, this existing arrangement is not readily apparent from the front or rear of the property and is less visible than the introduction of the three dormers would be. As such, the proposed dormers would have more visual intrusion than the current arrangements.
  7. The Appellant states that the side dormers would not be visible from Minster Road, however I find that they would be partially visible from certain angles. Although they would be set back from the front and would utilise a dark grey zinc material in order to blend in with the roof, they would still be partially visible from the road. I noted that there were side dormers present on a property on the opposite side of the road and also on a property on Asmara Road which were in proximity to the appeal site. However there were few other examples in the immediate surroundings. In addition, the rear dormer would be visible from certain views from Westbere Road. I therefore find that the proposed dormers would represent an incongruous feature which would harm the character and appearance of the area.
  8. I have had regard to the examples of other roof alterations provided by the Appellant at Nos 34 and 36 Westbere Road which, from the photographs provided, appear to be visible from the roof of the appeal property. However, I have limited details of these and do not know the full circumstances behind their approval. As such, I can give these only limited weight in my consideration of the appeal proposal.
  9. The proposal would add timber cladding to the rear elevation and the Appellant states that this was to improve the insulation of the property and cover the differing brickwork. I have had regard to this, however there are very few examples of timber cladding present in the surrounding area and, despite the timber cladding being to the rear of the property, it would be out of keeping with the traditional brick which is representative of the immediate surroundings. I note that the Appellant advises that they could retain the brick to the rear elevation, however this would not overcome the harm arising from the proposed dormer windows identified above.
  10. I understand that the Appellant wishes to renovate their property and that the development has been designed to provide a better proposal than that which could be achieved under Permitted Development. I also acknowledge that the proposal would not result in undue harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents. Nevertheless, these benefits do not outweigh the harm to the character and appearance of the host building and surrounding area identified above.
  11. Accordingly, the proposal fails to comply with Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan (2017) which seeks to secure high quality design in development, which respects local context and character. It also fails to accord with the advice in the Camden Planning Guidance Design CPG 1 (2018) which states that roof alterations are likely to be unacceptable where there would be an adverse effect on the appearance of the building, amongst other things.

*Other Matters*

12. I note the Appellants dissatisfaction with the planning application process. However, this is a matter between the Appellant and the Council.

**Conclusion**

13. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*R Norman*

INSPECTOR