

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		28/02/2012	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		01/02/2012	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number</b>			
John Sheehy				2011/6416/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
Flat 19 St Regis Heights Firecrest Drive London NW3 7NE				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>Proposals</b>							
Erection of glazed and zinc roof extension (following removal of existing staircase enclosure) and installation of glass balustrading at roof level to create terrace all in connection with existing dwelling (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendations:</b>		<b>Refusal</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>26</b>	No. of responses No. electronic	<b>9</b> <b>5</b>	No. of objections	<b>9</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>Site Notice displayed for 3 weeks</p> <p>Nine objections were received from occupiers of the building and neighbours, including an objection from the management company of the building. In summary the following concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed structure would be visible from the entrance to development, from nearby Birchwood Drive, Mansion Gardens and Grange Gardens;</li> <li>Proposed extension not in keeping with neighbouring residences;</li> <li>"Any external structure deviation by one flat owner over three or four identical flats on the same level and elevation would be detrimental to the whole";</li> <li>Loss of privacy as a result of terrace and views downwards to neighbouring properties;</li> <li>How will large structure and balustrading be moved onto the position on the roof? - no method statement or health and safety documents provided;</li> <li>Curved zinc roof should be in lead to match other roof items;</li> <li>What would be the structural effect on the building as a whole?;</li> <li>St Regis Heights an award winning design and there are various covenants in existence to maintain its excellent design.</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>		Not in a CA					

## Site Description

The application relates to a 6-storey apartment building within Firecrest Drive, a residential development constructed in the 1980s and comprising a mix of apartment buildings and low-rise family dwellings.

The estate is constructed in the post modern style and features extensive use of brown brick.

The application flat is on the top floor of St Regis Heights, a substantial apartment building at the centre of the estate.

The building is not listed and is not located in a Conservation Area

## Relevant History

### Original permission

**May 1982** Planning permission granted for development of the site by the erection of houses and flats, ref. 33510/R3.

### Other applications

#### *Roof enclosure and terrace*

**April 1996** Planning permission granted for erection of a roof terrace to St Regis Heights incorporating railings and new roof access enclosure, 9501810.

**IMPLEMENTED:** *this application appears to relate to a neighbouring top-floor flat.*

## 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

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### **Camden Design Guidance 2011**

#### **London Plan 2011**

## Assessment

### Design/ appearance

The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. Policy DP24 states that applications for alterations and extensions to buildings should consider the character, setting, context, form and proportions of the existing building. Policy DP24 also states that developments should also consider the quality of materials used.

The key design considerations are as follows:

- Camden Planning Guidance 1 - Design states that in order to be acceptable a roof extension or alteration should be sympathetic to the age and character of the building and should retain the overall integrity of the roof form. Para 5.8 of CPG1 states that a roof extension is likely to be unacceptable in certain circumstances, and includes the following specific example of where such an extension would be unacceptable:
  - "The building is designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level"

The building is a substantial, imposing brick structure, part of a wider development. It was designed as a whole composition and has a large degree of symmetry particularly in views from the front and rear. The building is of a very high quality of design and construction. It has a tidy, clean roofline. It was designed by Ted Levy, a notable architect who produced high quality buildings in the Hampstead and Highgate area in the 1960s, 70s and 80s;

- Access to the flat roof is via an existing glazed escape structure. This is a subordinate lightweight extension of modest dimensions, mainly glazed, and not prominent on the roofline. This appears to be

an original feature of the building. The proposed extension would provide an additional level of accommodation in the form of a much larger solid extension which would be more prominently visible than the existing escape structure. There are other enclosures on the roof including a lead water tank but there are no other roof structures of the scale proposed;

- Alterations and additions that would detract from the clean lines of the existing roofline or disturb the perceived symmetry of the building which has a careful composition would, cause harm to its appearance. While the roof extension would be located away from the most prominent gable ends, it would be sufficiently visible to add clutter to the clean roof lines and would be clearly visible over long views from a number of directions
- The extension would lead to a piecemeal pattern of development of additions and projections at this level which would not reflect the original carefully-designed largely symmetrical composition. As a result the proposed extension does not reflect and integrate with the existing building as a whole;
- The frameless glass balustrade around the roof terrace would not reflect the detailed design and materials used on the application building which has generally metal balustrading. As a result this element of the scheme would also fail to integrate successfully with the application building;

The proposed additional accommodation would not sufficiently consider some of the key design characteristics of the building and is refused on this basis.

#### Other issues/ Neighbour concerns

There would be no loss of privacy to neighbours as views from the proposed terrace would replicate those from windows elsewhere in the building and another nearby roof terrace without opening up any new views.

Given the location, form and scale of the proposed enclosure it would not cause a loss of sunlight, outlook or daylight to neighbouring occupiers.

Due to its rooftop location any noise pollution from the roof terrace would be extremely limited and would not cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Any covenants to limit external alterations to the building are separate from Camden's planning policies and can only be given very limited weight when considering a planning application.

**Recommendation:** refusal.

#### **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***