



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 August 2020

by D. Szymanski, BSc (Hons) MA, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th August 2020

Appeal Ref: APP/X5210/D/20/3247346
58 Twisden Road, London, NW5 1DN

- 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 Mr & Mrs Farrington against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
 - The application Ref: 2019/2274/P dated 29 April 2019, was refused by notice dated 5 December 2019.
 - The development proposed is new rear roof extension and new front roof lights to an existing property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum Neighbourhood Plan (DPNP) was adopted by the Council on 2 March 2020. Consequently, I have had regard to the newly adopted policies in my decision and the parties have been provided with an opportunity to comment.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the host dwelling and whether it would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a mid-terrace dwelling located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area (DPCA). The DPCA encompasses a variety of housing reflective of domestic architecture from the late 18th century onwards, described in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement. At my visit I found Twisden Road as a well-preserved street and roofline understood to date from the 1870's. The appeal site is one of a long terrace of dwellings with venetian windows and gables with decorative barge boards.
5. Within the DPCA there is a statutory duty under section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing its character or appearance. Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2019) (the

Framework) requires when considering the impact upon the significance of a designated heritage asset great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification (paragraph 194).

6. The appeal site contributes to the significance of the DPCA as one of the attractive well preserved dwellings in its terrace. Aside from a small number of roof lights, the roof retains its original slopes and form finished with ridge tiles and slate, sloping down to a gable at the front and to the outrigger at the rear. Notwithstanding some differing parapets, chimneys and occasional dormers in the wider terrace, the rear roof slope has value as part of an important, well preserved rhythmic visual backdrop to the York Rise Estate.
7. The proposed dormer would be almost the entire width of the appeal site roof. It would be set only a short distance below the ridge, protruding up to approximately 2.3m in depth and 1.5m in height. It would considerably modify and dominate the rear roof slope. Notwithstanding the compliance of the materials with advice in the Camden Planning Guidance the large glass panes of the metal framed windows would be at odds with the wooden sash windows of the host dwelling and many in the terrace. This would exacerbate its incongruous and harmful appearance.
8. Visibility is limited from streets to the east of York Rise. However, the rear roof slopes are prominently visible from a section of York Rise and a number of dwellings, gardens and parts of the adjacent York Rise Estate. The development would visibly and materially diminish the contribution of the dwelling to terrace and erode the wider group value of the terrace.
9. There are a limited number of dormers on this part of the terrace, more so than to the south. This includes full-width dormers at Nos. 72, 60 and 52. Four others I noted on Twisden Road were low profile, narrow and considerably smaller. Due to its height and width the appeal proposal would be likely to have similar obtrusive impact as the three large dormers. The large dormers pre-date the current development plan and Framework, and their presence does not justify allowing a further harmful development by allowing this appeal.
10. Given the positioning, size and lack of protrusion, and the presence of other rooflights in the front slopes of buildings, the two front rooflights, on-balance would preserve the character and appearance of the DPCA. However, this does not mitigate the harm I have found in respect of the dormer.
11. For the reasons set out above the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host dwelling, and it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the DPCA, adversely impacting upon its significance. Therefore, it would conflict with Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan (2017) (the CLP) and Policies DC3 and DC4 of the DPNP. In combination and amongst other things, these policies require that design respects local character and context, including the original character of the dwelling and roof form, and preserves or enhances the historic environment.
12. The Council's reason for refusal refers to Policy DC1 of the DPNP. However, it relates to specified protected views in Appendix 1 of the DPNP, maintaining verdant character and multi-unit developments. As the proposal is not visible

from the protected views and does not affect vegetation, this policy is not relevant to the proposal.

13. Paragraph 196 of the Framework and Policy D2 of the CLP require that where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to a designated asset, the harm should be weighed against the public benefits. However, less than substantial harm should not be equated with a less than substantial planning objection. It is suggested that the development would make the neighbouring larger dormer look less out of place. However, even if I were to agree, there would be greater overall harm from the appearance of the proposed development. The appellant's need for additional accommodation is noted but is a small public benefit. There would be a minor economic benefit from construction, but it would be short lived. The small public benefits do not outweigh the significant harm from the proposal, which attracts great weight. Therefore, the development conflicts with the Framework and Policy D2.

Conclusion

14. The proposed development would be contrary to the development plan and the National Planning Policy Framework. There are no other considerations advanced, including the policies of the Framework, which outweigh this finding. Accordingly, for the reasons given, the appeal should not succeed.

Dan Szymanski

INSPECTOR