



---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2019

**by Baljit K Muston BA(Hons) PGDip MBA MRTPI**

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

**Decision date: 02 May 2019**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/W/18/3216605**

**Maisonette, second and third floor, 21 Glenmore Road, London NW3 4BY**

- 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 Zoe Scott against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
  - The application Ref 2018/2673/P, dated 10 June 2018, was refused by notice dated 10 September 2018.
  - The development proposed was originally described as "*dormer loft conversion*".
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a dormer roof extension to the rear roof slope and installation of 4 x roof lights to the front elevation, all associated with the use of the property as maisonette, at Maisonette, second and third floor, 21 Glenmore Road, London NW3 4BY, in accordance with the terms of the application, 2018/2673/P, dated 10 June 2018, 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 development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Location plan, A100 Revision 1, A200 Revision 1, A300 Revision 1.

### Procedural Matter

2. The application was submitted as set out above. It was amended by the Council to the "*erection of a dormer roof extension to the rear roof slope and installation of 4 x roof lights to the front elevation all associated with the use of the property as maisonette*". This amended description makes the entirety of the proposal clearer and was used by the appellant on her appeal form. I have therefore determined the appeal on the basis of this revised description.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, with particular regard to the Belsize Conservation Area.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is within the Belsize Conservation Area (BCA), which is based upon a substantial area of predominantly 19<sup>th</sup> and some early 20<sup>th</sup> century houses lying

to the south-west of Haverstock Hill. Its significance stems from its large number of well-preserved buildings from this period and the very distinct characters of different parts of the Conservation Area, reflecting the historic development of the area as a suburb of London. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 requires me to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

5. The Council has adopted a Conservation Area Statement (CAS), which notes that the character of the BCA as a whole is largely derived from mid-19<sup>th</sup> century Italianate villas. It also identifies sub-areas of the Conservation Area. The appeal site lies within a sub-area based upon Glenloch, Glenmore and Howitt Roads. The CAS notes that this is a distinct area of Edwardian terraced housing and that, on entering this sub-area, there is a change in character from larger, grander, villa development to more modest family housing of a much smaller scale and tighter grain.
6. As described in the CAS, *"houses along Glenloch, Glenmore and Howitt Roads are two storey red brick terraces with a basement and an attic storey within a slate-faced mansard. At roof level, the party walls are expressed as upstands with shared chimneys located at the ridge that step up the street."* It points out that all the terraces *"have three light, two storey bays and dormers and utilise render and white painted timber frames to provide contrast"*, and that *"the elevations give strong rhythm and consistency to the terrace except where this is interrupted by inappropriate alteration."*
7. The front elevations of the dwellings in Glenmore Road display a high degree of uniformity, with little evidence of additions or major alterations. However, to the rear, the picture is quite different, particularly at roof level. When seen from the rear garden of the appeal site, dormer windows are a very obvious characteristic of the rear elevations of the dwellings on both Glenmore and Howitt Roads, which face each other across what the CAS describes as their *"tiny rear gardens"*. Some of these, on both roads, appear to be original dormer windows at second floor level. However, on many of the dwellings in this part of Glenmore Road, these dormers have been extended and/or altered. In addition, there are a number of examples, to the rear of the Glenmore and Howitt Road terraces in this area, of additional dormer windows at third floor level. This includes a large dormer window and high level balcony at 19 Glenmore Road, the adjacent property to the south-west, allowed on appeal in 2013, which extends right up to the ridge of the roof.
8. The character and appearance of the part of the BCA around the rear of the appeal site, visible only from the rear elevations and rear gardens of nearby properties, now includes a variety of dormer windows, both original and altered, at second floor level, and a number of additional dormer windows at third floor level. Set against this background, the proposed dormer window at third floor level at the appeal site, within a few metres of a much larger roof extension at No 19, would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building, the wider terrace, and that of the BCA which has evolved in this immediate area.
9. The CAS includes Guidelines, which it intends should provide the framework for development proposals. These include BE26 and BE27, which deal with roof extensions. Guideline BE26 lists circumstances when these would be unlikely to be acceptable. These are where it would be detrimental to the form and character

of the existing building, where the property forms part of a terrace which remains largely unimpaired, where the balance of a symmetrical composition would be upset, and where the roof is prominent, particularly in long views. In this case, the proposed dormer window would be adjacent to an existing, larger roof extension, and the roof cannot be seen from public viewpoints. In addition, the appeal property does not form part of a symmetrical composition and, in my view, in the context in which it would be seen, would not be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building.

10. Guideline BE27 says that further dormers at the rear will normally be allowed if sensitively designed in relation to the building and other adjacent roofs. To my mind, this is the case here, particularly when taking into account the existing roof extension on the neighbouring dwelling.
11. The Council also refers to the Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) on design. At paragraph 5.7, this lists cases where roof alterations are likely to be acceptable. This includes where there are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm. This is the case in the vicinity of the appeal site. At paragraph 5.8, the CPG sets out where a roof alteration is likely to be unacceptable, none of which apply in this case.
12. Paragraph 5.11 of the CPG provides more detailed guidance on the design of roof dormers. The proposal is on a relatively shallow pitched roof, does not align with windows below, and is not clearly subordinate to those windows. In these respects, it does not conform to the guidance in paragraph 5.11. However, given the existence of the relatively recently constructed and larger roof extension on the adjoining property, on a similarly shallow pitched roof, I do not consider that this should be a determinative factor in the case.
13. The proposal also includes the insertion of 4 rooflights at third floor level in the front roofslope. The Council's Conservation Area Advisory Committee has objected to these. However, I note that the Council considered that they would not be harmful to the integrity of the roof form and, due to the shallow pitch of the upper roof slope, are unlikely to be visible in public or private views. I see no reason to disagree with that assessment.
14. I conclude that the proposal would not give rise to any harm to the overall character and appearance of the area and would preserve the character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area. , It would therefore accord with Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 which amongst other matters seek to ensure that new development is of high quality design, respects local context and character, and preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area in which it sits. The compliance with these development plan policies and the guidelines within the CAS outweighs any limited non-compliance with the CPG.

### **Conditions**

15. The Council has not provided a list of suggested conditions in the event of the appeal being allowed. Notwithstanding that, as well as the standard time condition, a condition relating to compliance with the approved plans is necessary, in the interests of providing clarity and certainty.

**Conclusion**

16. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

*Baljit K Muston*

INSPECTOR