

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>28/03/2012</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>15/03/2012</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Jenna Litherland			2012/0660/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
36 NETHERHALL GARDENS LONDON NW3 5TP			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 roof extension within central valley of roofslopes and creation of roof terrace over enclosed by glass balustrading and access via new sliding glazed doors in the existing roof and addition of rooflights over the front pitched roof dormer window all in connection with existing flat (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant conditional permission</b>			
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Full Planning Permission</b>			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	16	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notice displayed from 16/02/2012 until 08/03/2011. Advertised in the Ham and High on the 23/02/2012.</p> <p>No representations received.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p><b>Fitzjohns/Netherhall CAAC:</b> No objection</p> <p><b>Heath and Hampstead Society:</b> Objection. We invariably oppose roof terrace proposals if they are located on top of buildings, and we object to this one.</p> <p>It may be positioned set back from the front and rear main walls of the house, but it still is unacceptable, for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It would intrude into the skyline of the house, and damage the architectural character of it. The application is accompanied by 2 photomontages whose intention is to show that the terrace would be (almost) imperceptible; these are misleading. They are drawn from selected viewpoints, and also minimise the physical presence of the work; it would be visible, and intrusive from many angles. <b>Case officer response: The application has been amended so that the roof terrace is set back from the front elevation by a further half a metre which ensures that the glass balustrade will not be visible from street level.</b></li> <li>2. It would lead to overlooking of adjacent gardens, especially from a great height; significant loss of privacy would result. <b>Case officers response: The set in from the front and rear elevations ensures that the proposed roof terrace will not result in overlooking.</b></li> <li>3. The glass balustrading, presented as something which would reduce visibility, would in fact be conspicuous and intrusive in itself. Reflections from glass draw attention to it. <b>Case officers response: As the roof terrace has been set back further from the front elevation it will not be visible from street level. The only views of the glass balustrade will be at the upper floors of the properties on Maresfield Gardens, however these views will be oblique views and the roof extension will appear some distance away.</b></li> <li>4. It would become the focus of parties and other social occasions (this plainly one of its intended functions). Due to its significant size and elevation, disturbance and noise pollution would result, damaging to the privacy and legitimate enjoyment by neighbours of gardens in the area. <b>Case officers response: Given reasonable use of the roof terrace it is not expected to result in activity which would create an unacceptable level of noise.</b></li> </ol> <p>Please refuse.</p>					

## Site Description

The application site comprises a 4 storey red brick detached property located on the southern side of Netherhall Gardens which is divided into flats. The site is located within Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area and is identified in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy as making a positive contribution to the conservation area.

## Relevant History

**8905222:** Planning permission was granted on 13/09/1989 for the construction of a roof terrace. This permission has not been implemented.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5: Managing the impact of growth and development  
CS14: Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage  
CS15: Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity  
DP24: Securing High Quality Design  
DP25: Conserving Camden's heritage  
DP26: Managing the impact of the development on occupiers and neighbours

### Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 – Design

### Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS)

## Assessment

Planning permission is sought for the erection of roof extension within central valley of roofslopes and creation of roof terrace over enclosed by glass balustrading and access via new sliding glazed doors in the existing roof and addition of rooflights over the front pitched roof dormer window.

**Amendment** – The proposal originally also included a glazed roof extension over the ridge of the pitched roof on the eastern side of the building. The case officer advised the applicant that this was an inappropriate addition at this level which would appear particularly prominent from the garden of no. 38 and from the properties along Maresfield Gardens. It was considered that the proposed roof extension would not appear architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and would appear as an incongruous addition at roof level harming the appearance of the property and the wider conservation area. The applicant subsequently removed this aspect of the proposal from the application. The proposed roof terrace has also been set in further from the front elevation of the property to ensure that it will not be visible from street level.

**Design** – The proposed roof extension and terrace would be located in the centre of the roof between the main hipped roof of the dwelling and the pitched roof on the eastern side. The roof extension would be set back from the front elevation of the property by 2.5 metres and set behind the existing front turret. The roof extension would be bounded by a 1.1 metre high glass balustrade which owing to its set back position would not be visible from street level. To the rear the roof terrace and balustrade will be set 1.9 metres back from the rear elevation. The roof terrace may be visible in oblique views from the rear of properties on Maresfield Gardens, however given the set back, the scale of the proposed terrace and the distance between properties it will not appear dominant or overbearing. The terrace would be accessed by sliding doors on the inside roof slopes of the existing roof which would not be visible outside the site. It is considered that the proposed roof extension and terrace will preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Two roof lights are proposed on the pitched roof of the front dormer window. The proposed rooflights would be flush with the existing roof and would appear as a minor addition to the building. They would not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.

**Amenity** – As the roof terrace is located within the central part of the roof set in from the elevations it is considered not to result in any overlooking or loss of privacy. Concern has been raised by the Heath and Hampstead Society that the proposed roof terrace would create noise. Given reasonable use of the roof terrace it is not expected to result in activity which would create an unacceptable level of noise.

**Recommendation: Grant conditional permission**

## DISCLAIMER

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> March 2012. For further information see**

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>