

W I L L I A M T O Z E R
a s s o c i a t e s

RIBA chartered practice NZIA practice
UK | EU AU | NZ USA
42-44 New House 67-68 Hatton Garden London EC1N 8JY
+44 (0)20 7404 0675
enquiries@williamtozerassociates.com williamtozerassociates.com

PLANNING APPEAL:
WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS STATEMENT
Grounds of appeal

application reference 2019/2274

Prepared for: Eva and Andrew Farrington

Site Address: 58 Twisden Road, London, NW5 1DN

Case Details

Appellant: Mr & Mrs Farrington

Agent: William Tozer Associates

Local Planning Authority: London Borough of Camden

Conservation Area: Dartmouth Park Conservation Area

Listed Building: NA

Planning Application: 2019/2274/P

Decision date of application: 05/12/2019

Project: Erection of rear dormer extension and installation of two roof lights in front roof slope

1.0 Preface:

1.1 This appeal is made under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in respect of the London Borough of Camden's decision to refuse planning permission (application ref: 2019/2274/P) for a roof extension to an existing Victorian terraced property. The proposals entail the construction of a dormer roof extension to the rear roof slope and installation of two roof lights in the front roof slope.

1.2. The site is within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and the property is of typical stock for the area, being a Victorian mid-terrace house with a type of bay window and gable, rear two-storey closet wing, with stock brickwork and slate roof tiles. It should be noted the property is not statutorily listed, and there are no Article 4 directions related to the property or the immediate, surrounding context.

2.0 Introduction:

2.1 Below, we have quoted the Reason for Refusal, for ease of reference:

"The rear dormer window proposed, by virtue of its excessive scale and inappropriate design, would result in an addition which would detract from the form, style and character of the original building and row and would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and policies DC1, DC3 and DC4 of the Draft Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (referendum version) 2019."

2.2 Dormer extensions are a feature of the housing stock in this conservation area – indeed there are already many examples on Twisden Road, and the immediately adjacent, large dormer at no.60 Twisden Road. Camden listed the following applications as relevant application which were refused:

- 2008/1326/P at no.60 Twisden Road
- 2013/1028/P at no.66c Twisden Road

Applications which have been granted consent to alter the roof are:

- 2012/0852/P at no. 70 Twisden Road, Appeal Granted APP/X5210/D/12/2180660
- 2014/2815/P at no.66C Twisden Road
- 2015/2088//P at no.41 Twisden Road, Appeal Granted APP/X5210/D/15/3132754

2.3 The CAAC (Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee) objected to the scheme, however there were no objections from neighbouring properties or residents of Twisden Road.

3.0 Comments by CAAC (Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee)

3.1 The DP CAAC's stated that some of the dormers erected on Twisden Road are pre-CA designation, however this does not eliminate their physical appearance in terms of context for the proposal. The Planning appeal at no.70 Twisden Road (APP/X5210/D/12/2180660) acknowledges 'substantial additions at roof level at nos.52 and 60.' The planning inspector for the above appeal reiterates that "The delegated report indicates that other roof additional in the vicinity were constructed before current policies were adopted and in some cases prior to the designation of the conservation area. Nevertheless, these other additions exist and form part of the physical context in which the present proposals falls to be considered." While these roof extensions can be seen as harmful, it is not to say that any future roof extensions will be executed in the same harmful manner including the proposal at no.58.

3.1 The DP CAAC acknowledge "Nos 64–74 are an entirely different house type..." reinforces the fact the existing street views are not as consistent or untouched as led to believe. This is also reinforced by the case officer's assessment in the delegated report whereby it is stated 'the site does not lie in a 'complete terrace or group of buildings which have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations of extensions.'

3.2 It would seem unreasonable that the roof scape is being considered by DP CAAC in the wider context (e.g viewed down upon from Hampstead and Highgate ridge) given the wide variation in housing typologies and diversity of building styles and ages within the area adjacent to the Hampstead and Highgate ridge. The development, by nature of its modest size and typology will not have any negative impact within this vast expanse.

3.4 The DP CAAC are concerned that the roof spaces are too shallow, and therefore they are "non compliant with habitable space ... " however it should noted that internal alterations to lower the floor level, in conjunction with the dormer would allow the space to be compliant with habitable space standards as sufficient headroom would be gained. The property is not a listed property, and internal changes are of course not subject to planning permission. DP CAAC's assessment that roof lights would be used to "light non-habitable space," should also be disregarded for this reason.

3.5 Rooflights would have a minimal protrusion within the roof profile – and with projections of no more than 150mm.

3.6 It is not always feasible to seek alternative housing within the Dartmouth Park area, and while a growing young family is not a material planning consideration – DP CAAC should note the occupant is within their right to refurbish and extend their home rather than seek alternative accommodation within the area.

4.0 Response Delegated Report (Camden)

Design and Conservation

4.1 We believe that the proposal is in accordance with policy DC2 of the Draft Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan, as it preserves and enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. This is in addition to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan which have a similar requirement – to contribute positively to the preservation and enhancement of the appearance of the area.



Fig. 01 examples of dormer extensions designed by William Tozer Associates, in conservation areas, using contextual materials and minimal glass framing.

The scale of the roof extension has been designed to minimise the visual impact of the proposal, and its massing is proportional to the surrounding context. The extension allows the existing roofscape to remain dominant, and existing chimney stacks will be maintained therefore preserving features and a general rhythm of projections which enhance the historic characteristics of the terrace. Proposed windows blend in well with the roof and dormer cladding – and are better camouflaged than sash windows with mullions that are white painted. The scale and proportion of the fenestration is designed to be discreet in its appearance, in order to remain harmoniously with the sash windows on lower floors, rather than appear as deliberate historic imitations where not historically intended. (refer to fig.01).

4.2 Policy DC3 of the Draft Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan requires developments to respond and integrate with surroundings. The council refers to the plan advising ‘good design means ensuring that any extensions are in keeping with the setting and use good quality materials to complement the existing palette of materials used within the immediate area.’ The proposals are compliant in that they use high quality materials that are in keeping with the surroundings – for example matching the existing roof of the host property by using slate tiles for cladding.

Policy DC3 refers to using good quality materials to complement the existing palette, and does not prescribe materials as specifically, and only being as per the existing materials. As such black painted minimal window frames have been proposed – so as not to compete with the detailing of the fenestration to the host building and to blend in better with the slate tiles. The use of metal framed windows is in keeping with the context of the property, and the materials



Fig. 02 examples of dormer extension types in the immediate context of no.58 Twisden Road. Note that most dormers – even those with recent planning consents – are unable to maintain Camden’s prescribed 500mm distances from the boundary and the roof ridge, and have been approved in spite of this.

used in the construction of the existing building by creating a sympathetic distinction between the original features and new additions to the host property. (refer to fig.01). Additionally, painted metal windows do not harm and contrast to the Victorian appearance of the property as they blend in better with the colour of the roof tiles and the sooty, Victorian London stock brick.

4.4 By referencing paragraphs 4.2 – 4.5 of the CPG ‘Altering and extending your home’ the council agrees that the street is not within a ‘complete terrace or group of buildings which have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extension.’ Camden also agrees that consequently, an appropriately designed, sensitive roof top additional may be accepted in this location.

4.5 The CPG, section 4.4.b advises sufficient distance between the ridge – usually 500mm or from party wall and eaves to maintain adequate separation. This is not feasible, and it can be noted existing dormers – including those with planning consent – do not maintain a c.500mm distance from the party wall or the eaves. Fig.02 and Fig.03 demonstrate that none of the dormers that have been built have achieved such requirements. The proposed dormer at no.58 would also not cut through the ridge.

4.6 The siting, design and appearance of the proposed rear dormer is not inappropriate – given the existing context and does not detract from the style and character of the original buildings –

W I L L I A M T O Z E R
a s s o c i a t e s

RIBA chartered practice NZIA practice
UK | EU AU | NZ USA
42-44 New House 67-68 Hatton Garden London EC1N 8JY
+44 (0)20 7404 0675

enquiries@williamtozerassociates.com williamtozerassociates.com

the proposal is discreet and easily distinguishable from the original property, allowing both to exist harmoniously.



TWISDEN ROAD STREET ELEVATION

Fig.03 (above) showing the extension at no.58 in context, alongside the other alterations to Twisden Road, and fig.04 (below) showing a selection of images indicating the varying dormer widths and views of the rear of Twisden Road including no.60 immediately adjacent. The more proportionate, smaller and less dominant dormer design for the host property will add balance to the roofline by helping the neighbouring dormer to look less out-of-place.



William Tozer Associates Limited
company number: 06814121
Registered in England
registered address: 42-44 New House 67-68 Hatton Garden London EC1N 8JY
VAT number: 815418045

4.7 Camden references more appropriately sized dormers on Twisden Road – some of which were granted following a successful appeal. It is however difficult to ignore examples pre-dating current planning policies given their close proximity to no.58 Twisden Road. High quality dormer extensions which are contemporary and sit sympathetically within the context through the use of materials and careful design, preserve and enhance the character of the street. The dormer remains significantly smaller than the immediately neighbouring dormer (and others on the street), given it is offset to either side of the boundary, and from the line of the eaves, while maintaining the original line of the closet wing.

4.8 Camden state that the group character of the terrace is at risk, and that the proposals fail to preserve the special character of the area. The council have also quoted DP CAAC's appraisal notes and believe "the roofscape is highly visible from the top of Spencer Rise and Chetwynd Road and from the York Rise Estate." It is tenuous to assume Spencer Rise and Chetwynd Road afford distinguishable views of the property, and fig.05 shows views down towards Twisden Road from Spencer Rise and Chetwynd Road. It may be that there are views from some of the upper floors of the properties on these streets, but this is less visible from the public realm. The views from York Rise Estate are more prominent, as the Estate sits opposite Twisden Road and shares a private road from where the back of the terrace can be seen. Spencer Rise shows a glimpse of the York Rise Estate. At street level there are only glimpses of the York Rise Estate from York Rise.



Fig.05 Google street views showing views down to Twisden Road from Spencer Rise and Chetwynd Road, from the top of the hill.

4.9 It is noted that roof lights proposed in the application are not contested by Camden, provided these have minimal projections, match other roof lights and are suited to conservation areas.

5.0 Amenity

5.1 Camden does not consider the siting, size and scale of the dormer to cause any significant loss of light or outlook to neighbouring properties surrounding the site. The proposal would not result in significant overshadowing or overlooking of neighbouring rooms or gardens.

6.0 Conclusion

While existing extensions on Twisden Road can be considered ungainly, the proposal for no.58 Twisden Road is of a high-quality design that is both contextual and contemporary. The dormer will positively contribute to the local character and distinctiveness of the area, whilst having minimal impact on the existing properties in the surrounding area in general. The proposal references the materials of the house as requested by the Camden Planning Guidance 'Altering your home.' Full consideration has also been given to the relevant policies within the Camden Planning Guidance including the Camden Local Plan, The Draft Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (2019), Camden Planning Guidance and the Dartmouth Park Conservation Appraisal and Management Plan 2009. Due to its modest size (set back from the rear elevation building and only projecting 2.4m in depth and 1.5m), it would not result in overlooking or overshadowing. The proposal will increase the amenity of the host property without detriment to its neighbours or the character of the area. Overall the proposal will not cause detriment to the property or the conservation area, and a well executed extension of this scale will help to improve the balance of the neighbouring property at no.60.

For these reasons we believe the appeal should be upheld and present planning consent should be granted.