

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	27/07/2012
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	19/07/2012
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Gideon Whittingham			2012/2910/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
27 Willow Road London NW3 1TL			Refer to draft decision notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Erection of a second floor rear extension and roof extension to create new third floor, including three rooflights on front roofslope and rear terrace and balcony, all in association with second floor flat. (Class C3).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	24	No. of responses	05	No. of objections	05
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 21/06/2012 (expiring on 12/07/2012) and a public notice was displayed in the local press (Ham &amp; High) from 28/06/2012 (expiring on 19/07/2012).</p> <p><u>The objection from the occupier of No. 26 Willow Road, flat 5 (summary):</u> <i>-the angle proposed is unsympathetic, it should match the existing, rather than vertical</i> <i>-result in a loss of daylight to the occupiers of No.26 Willow Road.</i></p> <p><u>The objection from the occupiers (2) of No. 26 Willow Road, flat 3 (summary):</u> <i>-result in a loss of daylight to the occupiers of No.26 Willow Road</i> <i>-the roof terrace would result in a loss of privacy and an increase in associated noise and disturbance and overlooking.</i></p> <p><u>The objection from the occupier of No. 26 Willow Road, flat 4 (summary):</u> <i>-result in a loss of daylight to the occupiers of No.26 Willow Road.</i> <i>-the roof terrace would result in a loss of privacy and an increase in associated noise and disturbance and overlooking.</i></p> <p><u>The objection from the occupier of No. 28 Willow Road (summary):</u> <i>-result in a loss of outlook</i> <i>-result in associated noise disturbance</i></p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p><u>The Heath and Hampstead Society objects (summary):</u> <i>-the roof terrace would result in a loss of privacy and an increase in associated noise and disturbance and overlooking.</i></p> <p><u>The Hampstead CAC objects (summary):</u> <i>-over development</i> <i>-harming the character of the terrace and surrounding conservation area</i> <i>-roof extension dominates the balance of the downhill terrace of houses</i> <i>-result in overshadowing to neighbours</i></p>					

## Site Description

The host building is four storeys tall comprising, basement, ground, first and second (mansard roof) floor levels. Divided into a number of self contained flats, this application relates to the upper floor level flat.

The building is located on the South side of Willow Road, with the junction of Christchurch Hill and East Heath situated to the North and Gayton Crescent to the West.

The building is located within Hampstead Conservation Area. Although the building is not listed it is recognised in the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement as a building which makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The predominant character of the surrounding area is, like the application site, residential in nature.

## Relevant History

### 27 Willow Road:

Ref:1298 – Pp Granted (12/03/1964) for the conversion into four self-contained flats.

### 28 Willow Road:

Ref: 8905023 - Pp Refused (03/08/1989) for the erection of a double pitch mansard roof extension and the formation of a rear roof terrace.

#### *Reason for Refusal 1:*

*The proposed roof extension would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the building and the visual amenity of the area, and would be contrary to the Council's policy for the control of additions at roof level within the Hampstead Conservation Area*

#### *Reason for Refusal 2:*

*It is considered that the full width rear terrace would be likely to result in unacceptable overlooking of adjoining properties and gardens to the detriment of their amenity.*

A subsequent appeal was allowed and planning permission was granted on 31<sup>st</sup> May 1990. This appeal decision is addressed in this report. The conclusions reached by the Inspector are material to assessment of the current application.

### 31 Willow Road:

Ref: 9005243 - Pp Refused (25/02/1991) for the erection of a rear roof extension to provide additional accommodation for second floor flat.

#### *Reason for Refusal 1:*

*The proposed roof extension would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the building and the visual amenity of the area, and would be contrary to the Council's policy for the Control of additions at roof level within the Hampstead Village Conservation Area.*

## Relevant policies

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

#### **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)

## **Assessment**

### **1. Proposal:**

1.1 The application proposes:

-The replacement of an existing 'L' shape hipped roof with a mansard roof extension located at second and newly created third floor level, for the provision of additional residential accommodation.

-To the front, the mansard at second floor would be set back from the parapet at a pitch of 82 degrees and comprise two dormer openings (as existing). At third floor level the new additional mansard style roof addition would be at a pitch of 40 degrees and comprise three rooflights, each measuring 0.7m (width) x1.2m (height).

-To the rear, the mansard at second floor level would be extended to be vertical with the rearward building line; brick faced and comprise two window openings. At third floor level, the mansard section to the East would be set back 2.5m from the rear parapet, incorporating sliding doors onto an external terrace (9sqm).The mansard section to the West would be pitched 60 degrees and comprise a dormer opening incorporating French doors onto a secondary terrace (3sq).

-At main roof level, the mansard would be flat topped with asphalt and incorporate three rooflights projecting approximately 250mm above the roof.

- The mansard would rise approximately 1.6m above the existing front roof ridge and 0.5m above the rear roof ridge. The associated East flank boundary wall would rise 2m in height.

-The extension would provide approximately 64sqm of additional residential accommodation, namely a kitchen/living room, at third floor level.

1.2 The main issues for consideration are:

- The impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it forms part and the surrounding conservation area and;

- The impact that the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

### **2. Impact on the host building and surrounding conservation area:**

2.1 The host building is located on the South side of Willow Road, comprising Nos.8-32 (cons). Although the terrace is noted by its considerable variety of design within it, the majority of buildings are three storeys in height, featuring few examples of additional storey at main roof level. Extensions to have taken place at main roof level within this terrace have typically been limited to dormer windows and rooflights. These relatively lightweight and restrained alterations have allowed each building, representing its own particular design to sit comfortably with its neighbours without significantly dominating each other

2.2 Predating the adoption of the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (2001), the Council's LDF Policies (2010) and CPGs (2011), roof level extensions rising more than one storey have only been allowed within this terrace in isolated cases owing to unique circumstances. Adjoining the application property to the West, No.28 received consent, by way of an allowed appeal, to erect a double pitched

mansard extension. This was allowed on appeal in 1990, significantly pre-dating the current policy context.

The Inspectorates view was:

“Since the relationship of the appeal property [No.28] to its neighbours [Nos.27 and 29] is so unusual, I do not share the concern, expressed by a number of local people, which the grant of permission to the present proposal would serve as a precedent for other proposals that might cumulatively have adverse effects on the skyline within the conservation area.”

2.3 By virtue of its terminating roof height and position on the Willow Road incline to the West, the host building is considered to provide a valuable aide providing the necessary transition between what is considered to be the incongruous roof height of No.28 and the three storey buildings typifying the character of the terrace to the East. Therefore, the scale and size of the host building highlights a relatively continuous horizontal line running through the terrace, providing a balance. In this respect, the increase in height of the host building, by approximately 1.6m above the existing front roof ridge and 0.5m above the rear roof ridge, would compromise the beneficial influence the host building provides within the terrace.

2.4 In terms of detailed design, the host building and its existing hipped ‘L’ shape roof has been designed as a complete composition, where its architectural style would be undermined by a significant increase in height or perceived bulk. The height at which the existing hipped roof terminates represents a well proportioned extension, where the overall balance of the building, in terms of floor level hierarchy is maintained. It is considered the proposed roof level extension would introduce a mansard of atypical proportions, which would unbalance the appearance of the host building and unduly dominate the architectural character at the lower levels. A two storey mansard is not considered appropriate in this location, with a single mansard level providing a natural terminating point for such a building. At the rear, replacing the current pitched roof with two further brick faced storeys rising vertically would be contrary to advice in CPG1, irrespective of its expanse of glazed openings. The detailed design of the top floor level, particularly the fenestration, extent of railings and projection of rooflights, would not relate to the style of the host building.

2.5 The adjoining building of No.28, by virtue of its detailed design is considered incongruous, whereby its roof extension translates poorly to the character and appearance of the remaining properties along the terrace. The host building however is considered to comprise traditional features of an appropriate composition whereby an additional storey, which the proposal would essentially introduce, would represent an incongruous, overly dominant and bulky roof level addition, at odds with the character and appearance of the terrace and the surrounding conservation area.

2.6 In terms of viewpoints, the front elevation would be the subject of public views along Willow Road and the Heath. Although the pitch of the extension would be obscured to some extent from Easterly views by the enlarged party wall, the party wall alteration in itself would represent an unsympathetic alteration of significant bulk, particularly when compared to No.26. Whilst the rear elevation would not be subject to public views, the occupiers of the surrounding properties would noticeably view the roof level extension, by virtue of its general form, as alien to the host building.

2.7 Within this context, it is considered the double pitch (two storey) mansard roof extension located at third floor level, by virtue of its height and detailed design would represent an overly dominant, visually intrusive structure which would be at odds with the modest character of the host building, the terrace of which it forms a part and the surrounding conservation area, contrary to policy within the LDF and guidance in the CPG.

### **3. Neighbour amenity**

3.1 It is considered that no undue harm would be caused with regard to the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk or sense of enclosure.

3.2 Although the projection rearwards, to some degree, would limit the East/West outlook of the neighbouring windows, namely of Nos.26 and 28, its extent would not materially harm the living conditions of nearby residents to justify a reason for refusal on this basis.

3.3 Whilst the primary roof terrace is larger than those found within the terrace, capable of accommodating a number of people, it is considered the sizeable party walls proposed either side and location at main roof level would limit the opportunity to overlook the neighbouring properties and gardens below. In terms of noise and disturbance, it is considered the typical activity associated with a roof terrace of this size would not result in associated noise and disturbance that would cause significant adverse harm to the neighbouring properties.

**4. Recommendation:** Refuse Planning Permission

**Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444***