

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	14/08/2013
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	17/07/2013
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Hugh Miller			2013/3851/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
10c St. Augustines Road London NW1 9RN			See decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of full width rear dormer and side gable extensions to roof level of first floor flat (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):	Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	18	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Advertised in the press: 04/7/2013, expires 25/7/2013. Site Notice displayed: 26/6/2013, expires 17/7/2013.</p> <p><u>10A St. Augustines Road – No objection</u> I own and live in the lower ground floor/basement flat of this building and have no objection to planning permission being granted for this application.</p> <p><u>12 St Augustine's Road - Comment</u> While in principle I am in favour of converting the loft into usable living space, my chief concern is the appearance from the street of the proposed side elevation (west side), which would seem quite out of sympathy with other similar properties, nor an attractive or harmonious design, disturbing the balance of the building. The same may apply to the rear elevation, but that will not be readily visible for us.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	Camden Square CAAC: At time of writing no response was received.					

Site Description

The application building forms a pair of semi-detached properties nos. 10 and 12, which is located on the south side of St. Augustine's Road. It is located east of the junction with Murray Street and Agar Grove and north of Agar Grove. The building is converted into self-contained flats. It is not listed but is located in Camden Square conservation area.

Relevant History

June 2013 – Planning Application Withdrawn - Erection of full width rear dormer and side gable extensions to roof level of first floor flat (Class C3); ref.2013/2019/P

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting High Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing High Quality Design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 (Design): Section 4 - Extensions, alterations and conservatories, Section 5 – Roofs, terraces and balconies

CGP6 (Amenity)

Camden Square conservation area appraisal and management strategy 2011

The London Plan 2011

NPPF 2012

Assessment

Situation

In the history section above a previous planning application for similar roof extension was withdraw by the applicant upon advice from officers regarding detail design matters.

On June 10th, the applicant submitted revised drawings of the roof extension for officers to comment on. The conclusion was other than minor adjustment the revised scheme remain largely unchanged and is considered unacceptable and not in accordance with LDF policies DP24, DP25 also Camden's guidance on roof extensions set out in CPG1.

Proposal

Erection of full width rear dormer and side gable extensions to roof level of first floor flat (Class C3).

The key considerations are **a]** the impact of the design on the character and appearance of the building and the Conservation Area and **b]** impact on residential amenity. These are addressed below in the context of planning policy and other material considerations.

Design

Properties nos. 4/6 and 8 and 10-12 are 2-stories in height and form two pairs of semi-detached houses with raised brick parapet at the front elevation and shallow pitched roofs excluding parapets on the sides or at the rear. To the east the semi-detached neighbouring houses (nos.14-18 to the end) are 3-storeys in height with similar shallow pitched roofs and no parapet at the roof level; and large chimney stacks. It is noted that these 3-storey semi-detached houses have no dormer windows. The Conservation Area Statement states in paragraph 5.9, that *"All properties are considered to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area unless listed as neutral or negative"*.

Gable roof form is not an established feature of the host building or the neighbouring semi-detached houses. The houses on both sides of St. Augustine's Road share a common yet distinctive shallow pitch hipped roof. The gable roof proposal in terms of detailed design scale and proportions is considered unacceptable, detracting from the appearance of the subject building and would be a discordant element, detracting from the roofscape and group value of the adjacent semi-detached properties.

Policy DP25 of the LDF states that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area. Paragraph 5.6 of CPG 1 (Design) states that roof extensions and alterations are likely to be *unacceptable* where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. It goes on to identify particular characteristics which would make alterations unacceptable including:

- *"Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design;*
- *Buildings or terraces which already have an additional storey or mansard;*
- *Buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves;*
- *The building is 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 additional extension"*

The policy justifications go on to amplify that *"extensions to roofs will not always be acceptable. There will be situations, which are particularly sensitive to roof extensions...such as where a street retains*

its original unaltered roofline. It is therefore important to preserve the roofs unaltered where this occurs". In principle therefore, a roof extension would be unacceptable.

The dimensions of the proposed dormer is as follows:

Width 5.07m x depth 6.24m x height 2.4m.

The proposed dormer is considered to be excessive in its scale and proportions, something which is exemplified by the shallow pitched roof. It is noted that the proposed dormer would be set below the roof apex by approximately 500mm in accordance with the CPG guidelines and also back from the east and west sides of the host roof. The proposed dormer would remove the distinctive shallow hipped roof on the side and rear roof. Only a dormer of considerably small size would be acceptable, but this would not provide adequate internal headroom height. The detailed design of the roof extension including the proposed window types, their scale and proportions are considered unacceptable, detracting from the appearance of the subject building and the wider area. The introduction of such a roof extension would be a discordant element, detracting from the roovescape and group value of the properties. The proposed roof extension would give the building an unacceptable amount of additional bulk in both long and short views at the rear along Agar Grove.

The proposed roof extension is considered unacceptable for reasons as follows:

- the properties within the group nos. 4/6-12 have a roof line that is unimpaired by alterations or extensions.
- the host building and properties within the semi-detached pairs have shallow pitch roofs, so any new additions required to create additional accommodation in the roof would need to be of sufficient height to achieve an acceptable internal head room.
- the roof extension would add significant bulk and massing to the host building and unbalance the architectural composition of the hipped roof form an established character of the host and neighbouring houses on the south side of St. Augustine's Road. It would not appear subordinate and generally upset the balance and coherence of the surrounding roovescape, thus harming the appearance of the host building and the semi-detached pair of houses of which it forms part. It is noted that raised brick parapet is proposed as an added feature at the rear and this is considered as an alien element of clutter detracting from the simple roof form. Moreover, dormer windows should not be introduced to shallow-pitched roof due to the resultant added bulk that generally results from this type of roof extension. In terms of detail design, scale, form and pane size, the proposed dormer window would not relate to façade below and the surface area of the roof and it would not be subordinate within the roovescape.
- the host building and semi-detached properties have a roof profile that is exposed to important views from the public realm, Agar Grove and St. Augustine's Road also private views from dwellinghouses opposite the site. The gable roof form plus rear dormer together would add significant bulk and massing to the host building and unbalance the architectural composition. The combined roof extensions are a discordant element, detracting from the roovescape and are considered unacceptable. The proposed roof extension would be visually prominent and is considered unsympathetic; as noted in the Camden Square Statement (paragraph 7.8), which states:

"Proposals for alterations to roofs within the conservation area will be considered on their own merit but particular care is needed to ensure sensitive and unobtrusive design to visible roof slopes or where roofs are prominent in long distance views".

"Alterations such a raising the roof ridge and the steepening of the roof pitch to the front, side or rear slopes is unlikely to be acceptable. Dormer windows and inset roof terraces may be

allowed to the rear roof slope”.

- the proposed roof extension (gable and dormer window) would cause harm to the character, appearance and setting of the Camden Square Conservation Area.

NB. The application is related to a self-contained flat, which does not have permitted development rights to implement works in accordance with the various criteria of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 as amended. The 47 cubic metre annotated on the submitted drawings are therefore not material consideration relevant to the determination of the proposal.

The proposal is contrary to CPG roof alterations guideline and the Camden Square Statement guidelines, which discourages dormers on buildings which forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset.

By virtue of its size and siting, the dormer therefore creates an unacceptably obtrusive and incongruous form of development, disrupting the uniform appearance of the roofline of the properties along the south side of St. Augustine’s Road. On this basis the dormer is regarded to harm the historic character and appearance of the wider Camden Square Conservation Area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the design guidance of CPG 1 (Design) and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

Amenity

Policy DP26 of the LDF states that Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity.

The distance between the proposed dormer and the windows on the upper floors of the properties to the rear (along Agar Grove) is approximately 15m. This is 3.0m less than the 18m minimum distanced between directly facing windows recommended by the guidance on amenity set out in CPG6. Given that there are existing windows to the properties, it is considered that the views from the proposed dormer would not cause any significant additional impact on the amenity (loss of privacy/ overlooking of the adjacent occupiers and the proposal is considered acceptable.

The proposed dormers relationship to adjoining properties would also ensure that there is no loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook or an increased sense of enclosure, in accordance with CPG6 and policy DP26 of the LDF.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.

Photos



Front. Nos. 10 -12 & 14.



Rear Nos. 4 -6, 8, 10-12