

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		10/07/2013	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		10/06/2013	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Christopher Heather				2013/2915/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
33 Oppidans Road London NW3 3AG				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Alterations of existing roof extension including the replacement of front dormer and rear windows and addition of a balustrade to rear roof terrace in connection with residential flat (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional planning permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	10	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		None					
CAAC/Local groups* comments:		N/A					

Site Description

The site is a maisonette on the second and third floors of the site, which is one of a pair of properties. This section of Oppidans Road is characterised by pairs of semi-detached buildings. The site does not fall within a conservation area and is not a listed building.

Relevant History

January 1969: Planning permission (Ref: 6288) granted for "Construction of two rooms in roof space".

In addition, the following planning history from nearby sites is relevant:

January 1984: Planning permission (Ref: 8400597) granted for "Extension of upper flat into loft space including the erection of a roof extension" at **30 Oppidans Road**.

May 2011: Planning permission (ref: 2011/1353/P) granted for "Alterations including roof extension and installation of solar panel at roof level and the installation of doors and glazed balustrade in connection with use as roof terrace to dwelling (Class C3) at **32 Oppidans Road**.

June 2013: Planning application (Ref: 2013/1910/P) granted for "Installation of 5x photovoltaic panels at roof level of dwelling flat (retrospective) at **32 Oppidans Road**.

October 2009: Planning permission (Ref: 2009/3798/P) granted for "Alterations at rear roof level including the installation of balustrading for use as a terrace to existing single dwelling (Class C3)" at **34 Oppidans Road**.

May 2013: Planning permission (Ref: 2013/1400/P) refused for "Installation of a brick balustrade at roof level for use as a terrace to existing single dwelling (Class C3)" at **34 Oppidans Road**. The reason for refusal was:

The proposed brick balustrade by virtue of its siting, design and material would appear as an incongruous addition to the host building which fails to respect its character and integrity. It further causes harm to the relationship with the adjoining neighbour by eroding the eaves line of the property. This is contrary to Policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS4 (Areas of more limited change)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG 1 Design

CPG 6 Amenity

NPPF

Assessment

Proposal

The proposal would enlarge the existing roof extension by bringing it further forward. To the rear the extent of the extension would remain the same, but part of the roof would be removed to allow the creation of a roof terrace. A roof light is proposed to the extension.

Design

Policies CS14 and DP24 are of relevance, as is CPG1. The existing roof extension is poor and does little to enhance the building. The properties either side have roof extensions, with that at 34 being particularly unsympathetic. Planning permission was also granted in 2009 to alter it to the rear, and although this appears to have now expired it remains a material consideration. The extension at the adjoining property at number 32 is more recent, and part of the justification for it appears to have been that this site already had one.

The proposal has been amended by the applicant. This has altered the front so that it more closely matches what was approved at number 32 in 2009. Its width, detailing and materials would be broadly the same as next door.

Given that there is already an extension on the property there is no objection to altering it, and it does represent an opportunity to improve the situation. In addition, there are examples of roof extensions on a number of buildings nearby. Although not in a conservation area the building is not unattractive and it is important to ensure that any changes are as sympathetic as possible. Although part of the roof profile to the front would be removed the height of the building makes it quite difficult to appreciate the existing profile. The existing white, wooden structure there now is more obvious to the viewer. The street has a number of mature trees and sitting between two existing altered roofs views of the roof are not extensive. There are some opportunities to view the site from the estate opposite, but the trees restrict these views. Therefore, there are few short and long views, with it being visible from some limited 'medium' views. This is the context in which the proposal is judged at the front. Therefore, there is considered to be a benefit of removing the existing white wooden facing material, and the proposed extension would match more closely what is next door. This is weighed against the extension being brought forward. However, as the same exists next door, and this site is sandwiched between two others the proposal is considered acceptable.

To the rear there are views from Meadowbank, which is a private road but one with unrestricted access. A number of the properties have been altered by adding roof extensions. The existing rear roof extension exhibits the same white, wooden boards as it on the front and is full width. The existing extensions either side are also full width and the example at number 32 is particularly poor. The planning permission granted in 2009 would have resulted in a roof terrace with the balustrade extending to the edge of the roof. At number 34 retrospective planning permission has now been granted for solar panels. It also exhibits a glass balustrade and the same is proposed now. This would extend further towards the edge of the roof than is at number 34, but not as far as was judged to be acceptable at number 32 in 2009. Although now expired it is not considered that policy has changed so much that a tougher approach should be adopted now, especially outside of a conservation area. Behind the balustrade the depth of the rear of the roof extension remains unchanged, but the materials would be altered to include zinc cladding and glazing, which would improve the overall appearance when compared to now. It is noted that the provision of an obscurely glazed screen between the proposed terrace and the terrace at 32 Oppidans Road would have a minimal impact on the building's appearance when else is proposed (See section entitled *Neighbouring amenity* for further details. A rooflight is proposed but this would not be visible from any vantage points and so is considered acceptable.

Neighbouring amenity

Policies CS5 and DP26 are of relevance. To the front the impact is very similar to what is there now: there are no properties immediately in front of the site and the estate beyond is some distance away. To the rear the extension itself is not changed in extent, although the terrace is a new feature. There is a flank wall on the side of 34 Oppidans Road which would prevent any views from the terrace. There would be a potential impact on number 32 Oppidans Road. Some overlooking would be possible across the neighbouring roof terrace and into rear of the upper floor. This is to a degree mutual, but given that the existing extension at the site is slightly deeper than that at 32, and that the proposed terrace would extend further out than next door, then there is potential for slightly greater overlooking from number 33 than there is from number 32. Had the relationship been identical then it is arguable that no mitigation is required, but as the impact is slightly uneven then a condition is recommended to provide a screen between the two.

Behind the site is a road and some parking areas, and beyond this the fronts of properties in Meadowbank. This differs from the traditional public-private relationship and means that there is less of an expectation of privacy at these units. Notwithstanding this the distance between the terrace and these properties is in excess of 18m, and given that there is already one terrace at number 32 there is not considered to be an unacceptable impact on these neighbouring properties.

Other matters

The quality of the resulting accommodation would be improved, but this is not decisive in reaching a decision on this proposal.

Conclusion

To the front the proposal would better match what is next door, with no tangible harm caused due to the improvement on what is there now and the relative lack of visibility. To the rear the removal of the existing extension is positive, and what has been approved on the properties either side make it difficult to object to the proposal appearance, even if it would extend nearer to the eaves line what is currently the case. The impact on neighbours is largely unchanged, with the exception of overlooking to number 32, although the imposition of a condition can address this.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission with conditions.