

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		30/10/2023	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		11/11/2023	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Obote Hope				2023/3641/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat D 64 Menelik Road London NW2 3RH				Please refer to decision notice.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a gable roof extension and installation of a rear dormer roof extension to facilitate a loft conversion.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. of responses		00		No. of objections	
						00	
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>Site notices were erected from 18/10/2023 until 11/11/2023.</p> <p>No objections were received from local residents or from the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum.</p>					

Site Description

The property is a large double fronted two storey plus loft premises split into flats, with a large two storey rear side extension with a pitched roof and its own ground floor side extension. This application relates to the flat that is located in the first and loft floors of the two storey extension. The building is located on the north-eastern side of Menelik Road adjacent to its junction with Minster Road to the south-west.

The site is not located within a conservation area nor is it a listed building or located within the vicinity of any listed buildings. However, the host building is located within the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan area.

Relevant History

Application Site:

2018/5825/P – Variation of condition 2 (Approved Plans) of planning permission 2016/2545/P granted on 31/07/2017 for creation of terrace at first floor level, namely, omission of the setback of the balustrade associated with the first floor roof terrace and installation of roof planter to the rear elevation (retrospective). **Granted 23/07/2019**

2016/2545/P – Creation of terrace at first floor level. **Granted 19/07/2016.**

2012/2917/P – Side and rear extension at roof level with associated roof light to front elevation and balcony to rear elevation of existing flat (Class C3). **Refused 03/12/2012.**

Reason for Refusal:

- 1) The proposed roof extension, by reason of its height, bulk and design would result in a dominating form of development harming the host building and the character and appearance of the wider area.

2012/1177/P – Planning permission for the erection of single storey side extension at first floor level to dwelling flat (Class C3). **Refused 03/05/2012 and allowed on appeal on 05/03/2013.**

Reason for Refusal:

- 1) The proposed first floor side extension would, by virtue of its excessive bulk, height, scale and massing and inappropriate design, dominate the host property and appear incongruous in the street scene

F3/4/A/11721 – Planning permission for the conversion of No.64 Menelik Road, N.W.2 to provide three self-contained flats together with the formation of an additional parking space. **Granted 22/09/1971.**

16260 – Planning permission for the conversion of a double garage and the making of a single-storey side extension to form a 4th flat, including the provision of four car parking spaces on the hardstanding area. **Granted 11/09/1973.**

60 Menelik Road

2017/6172/P – Erection of side and front dormers with associated front roof terrace. Erection of ground floor part width rear extension and installation of ground floor bi-folding doors. Installation of two front roofslope rooflights. **Refused 19/01/2018**

Reason for Refusal:

- 1) The proposed roof extensions by reason of their scale, design and siting, would result in an overly dominant roofscape, fail to read as subordinate additions and cause harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and streetscene.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

The London Plan (2021)

Camden Local Plan (2017)

- A1 Managing the impact of development
- D1 Design

Camden Planning Guidance:

- CPG Amenity (2021)
- CPG Design (2021)
- CPG Home Improvements (2021)
- CPG Design (2021)

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a hip to gable roof extension and erection of a full width dormer extension to the rear roofslope of the existing two storey rear extension. This would facilitate a loft conversion, which would provide an additional 33.9sqm of ancillary residential accommodation.

2.1 Assessment

The material considerations for this application are as follows:

- Design
- Amenity

3. Design

- 3.1. Local Plan policy D1 (Design) requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance, and character of the area. The supporting text to this policy states that development should consider the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, the character and proportions of the existing building, the scale of surrounding development, and the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries, and uniformities in townscape.
- 3.2. The Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) on Design calls for Design Excellence and advises that new development should consider the context of the development and its surrounding area, the design of the building itself and opportunities for improving the character and quality of the area.
- 3.3. The Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) on Home Improvement advises that a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding streetscene, such as:
- Complete terraces or groups of buildings that have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions;
 - Buildings designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be

undermined by any addition at roof level;

- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by an additional extension;
- Buildings whose roof form or construction are unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves.

- 3.4. The application site is located within the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Area, which is subject to the policies of the associated Neighbourhood Plan. Policy 2 (Design & Character) of the Neighbourhood Plan states that development should be high quality and that extensions should be in character and proportion with the context and setting, and the supporting text to the policy states that roof extensions should “*fit in with existing rooflines and be in keeping with existing development*” and that extensions “*should be in proportion to the existing building*”.
- 3.5. The proposal involves the erection of a hip-to-gable extension and the erection of a rear dormer roof extension that would measure approximately 5.2m in width, 6.4m in depth, and 2.5m in height. The hip-to-gable extension would increase the roof level slightly from 7.6m to 8m. The roof extension would be constructed with tiling to match the existing roof colour and style, and the dormer would include two white aluminium-framed windows.
- 3.6. The proposed hip-to-gable extension would not reflect a characteristic feature of the street scene on Menelik Road. Although the character of the road is generally mixed in terms of extensions and alterations to the roofs of the main dwellings, all of the properties in the area limit the alterations at roof level to the main roof rather than the rear side extensions. The planning history section of this report details two instances, one of which at this property, where proposed extensions that would alter the form of the rear side additions were refused. The host property and the majority of the neighbouring properties all broadly follow the same pattern of development, which retains the pitched roof of the rear extension and some degree of symmetry. As such, it is considered that the hip-to-gable element of the proposal would be unacceptable in design terms as it would break this established pattern and have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the existing house or the street scene.
- 3.7. The proposed rear dormer would also result in a fundamental change to the shape and form of the roof slope at the rear of the property. It would project up to and beyond the height of the existing roof ridge on the rear extension and would cover almost the entirety of the rear roof slope. It should also be noted that the dormer would be sited in a part of the roof that would only exist if it was extended by the proposed hip-to-gable projection. It would effectively create a third storey to the property when viewed from the rear on Gondar Gardens and would not form a considerate or subordinate extension to the property that respects its existing use, form, and character. The extension would also be highly visible from the rear of the host property and neighbouring buildings, creating a sense of overbearing from its large scale. This would be especially evident when combined with the impact of the hip-to-gable extension. The proposed dormer would therefore not be in proportion to the existing building, contrary to the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.
- 3.8. The rear dormer extension would project beyond the roof ridge of the host building by approximately 3.5m at the deepest point, would include 2 x windows that are 1.1m high and 1.4m wide and 1 x rooflight to be installed to the front roof slope. The extension would be highly prominent from the wider area and have public visibility from Menelik Road and Minster Road, as well as some visibility from Hampstead Cemetery. The neighbouring properties along Menelik Road do not feature rear dormers at this level of the roof, and even the properties on Sarre Road have generally been extended sympathetically, with roof extensions not projecting beyond existing ridge heights. As noted earlier in this section of the report, there is a clear pattern of development amongst the rear side

extensions of the properties along Menelik Road, and none of these appear to feature dormers. As such the addition of a dormer in this location, notwithstanding the hip-to-gable extension, would be inappropriate and fail to integrate with the surrounding streets and neighbouring buildings, disrupting the character of the streetscape.

- 3.9. Given the context of its surroundings, the size and design of both extensions would therefore have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host property, adversely affecting the streetscene of Menelik Road. The additions would also fail to be subordinate to the host property and would not integrate with the existing scale, form, and proportions of the host property. In this instance, the proposal would detract from the character and appearance of the host property and immediate surrounding area.
- 3.10. Thus, both the hip to gable roof extension and the proposed dormer extension would be contrary with the overall aims and objectives of the Council's policies and planning guidance, including relating to roof extensions. The design and appearance would detract from the overall character and appearance of the host building and wider area and local distinctiveness in Menelik Road, which would be in conflict with policy 203 (paragraph c) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023, which requires new development to make a positive contribution to local area character and distinctiveness. As such, it is considered that the roof extension and rear dormer extension would harm the visual quality of the townscape and the visual amenity of the host building and its setting within the local area. The increased bulk and scale of the roof form combined with the size and scale of the dormer roof extensions would represent an overbearing, dominant, and incongruous addition that would detract from the character of the building and the urban design quality of the local area, which would be exacerbated by its prominent position and visibility.
- 3.11. The proposal would be contrary to the advice on roof extensions contained within the CPG on Home Improvement. The proposal would undermine the architectural style and the composition of building and would overwhelm the size and physical characteristics of the host property. The proposal would fundamentally change the height and bulk of the roof which would not be justified in the context of the building or the character of the area, under policy D1.
- 3.12. In addition to the size and siting of the roof extensions being unacceptable, the architectural design and materials would also detract from the aesthetics of the host building. Due to the size, positions, proportions, and alignment of the proposed windows, when viewed in the context of the host building and from the rear, the proposed windows would detract from the pattern and style of existing fenestration treatment, which would be harmful to visual amenity from rear gardens and local townscape to the rear. Thus, the proposed windows would also be contrary to Policy D1 and the advice contained within the Council's Planning Guidance.
- 3.13. For the above reasons, the proposal would be contrary to Policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and Policy 2 (Design & Character) of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015. As such, the application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

4. Amenity

- 4.1. Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. It seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG Amenity provides specific guidance with regards to privacy, overlooking

and outlook.

- 4.2. The proposed windows would not impact on the neighbouring amenity given the only new views created would look towards Hampstead Cemetery. There would be no overlooking into habitable rooms of neighbouring residents. As such, the proposal would not result in a loss of amenity for surrounding occupiers in terms of privacy.
- 4.3. The proposal would result in a small increase in the height of the roof. However, due to the positioning of the proposed roof extension and the minor increase in height, it is not likely that there would be a significant impact on the amount of sunlight or daylight received within the neighbouring properties. The hip-to-gable extension would have a separating distance of approximately 4.0m with no.79 Menelik Road with only one small window to the flank elevation of the neighbouring property. Thus, it is not considered that the proposal would have any significant impact with regards to daylight/sunlight. As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this regard.
- 4.4. The additional mass on the roof would not result in a significant loss of outlook for any surrounding occupiers. The other properties in the surrounding area do not face directly towards the proposal and the openness and aspect of their gardens would not be significantly harmed. As such, the proposal would not have a significant effect on the existing outlook available to other neighbouring properties.

5. Conclusion

- 5.1. Both the proposed rear dormer extension and hip-to-gable roof extension, by virtue of their form, size, siting, scale, and design would represent excessive, inappropriate, and incongruous additions to the building and wider streetscene that would disrupt the pattern of development of the surrounding area and be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building and wider area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and Policy 2 (Design & Character) of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan 2015. As such, it is recommended that the proposal be recommended for refusal.

6. Recommendation

- 6.1. Refuse planning permission.