Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expir	y Date:	23/08/2	010	
(Members' Briefing)					Consultation Expiry Date:		010	
Officer			Applicat	ion Number(	s)			
Jenny Fisher			2010/3393	3/P				
Application Address			Drawing	Drawing Numbers				
Flat C 94 Hillfield Road London NW6 1QA			Refer to d	Refer to decision letter				
	m Signature	C&UD	Authoris	ed Officer S	ignature			
		Design surgery 27/07/20	010					
Proposal(s)								
to convert to terrace with associated balustrade and privacy screen, all to top floor flat (Class C3).  Recommendation(s):  Grant planning permission with conditions								
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission							
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:								
Consultations								
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of respons	ses <b>03</b>	No. of o	bjections	03	
Summary of consultation responses:	Letters of objection have been received on behalf of the owners of flat 94B, from the occupant of the basement flat A and from the occupant of No. 96. Too close proximity to windows; intrusion of privacy and noise. Loss of daylight/sunlight to neighbouring gardens.  Amenity issues discussed in the assessment of the report below.  Roof belongs to freeholders of the property. Breach of terms of lease because failed to contact other leaseholders.							
	This is not a planning matter. Applicant signed Cert. B and declared notices served 17/06/2010							
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	N/A							

# **Site Description**

The property comprises basement, ground and three upper floors. It is within a terrace on the south/east side of Hillfield Road. In residential use, there is a basement flat and two on the upper floors. The top flat is currently vacant. Not within a conservation area.

This application relates to the maisonette on the top two floors.

## **Relevant History**

## 90 Hillfield Road

07/04/1988 (8703343) Change of use and works of conversion to form two self-contained flats and one maisonette including the erection of a single-storey rear extension at lower ground (garden) level the enlargement of the existing rear dormer and the formation of a roof terrace at rear second floor level.

#### 88 Hillfield Road

19/03/1987 (8700148) The use of the roof of the first floor rear addition as a roof terrace

## **Relevant policies**

## Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 (amenity for occupiers and neighbours);

B1 (general design principles):

B3 (alterations and extensions)

**Camden Planning Guidance (2006)** 

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

As the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have now been published, they are material planning considerations. However, as a matter of law, limited weight should be attached to them at this stage.

The following policies in the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have been taken into consideration

CS1 (distribution of growth);

CS5 (managing the impact of growth and development);

DP24 (securing high quality design);

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

## **Assessment**

#### Proposed

Front: installation of two conservation area style roof lights 0.7m. x 0.5m.

Rear: retention of an existing rooflight; replacement of an existing dormer window with a larger dormer extension. It would be tile hung to match the existing roof and two windows would be installed.

Second floor: the use of the rear roof as a terrace. The terrace would be enclosed with a metal balustrade and a 1.7m. high obscure glazed screen would be erected on the side edge of the roof. A door would be installed providing access to the terrace. The door surround would be brick matching existing. The terrace would be set back 1m. from the side facing the extension to No. 96 and 1m. from the rear roof edge. It would have a bevelled corner that would be 2m. back from the corner of the roof.

#### Amendment to original submission

Metal railings replace the glass balustrade originally proposed.

Two windows installed in the roof dormer to relieve the more solid appearance (a single window and greater areas of slate) originally proposed.

Erection of a 1.7m. high privacy screen.

#### Main issues for consideration are visual and amenity impact

#### Visual impact:

The terrace would be cut into the slope of the roof and will not be visible from the public realm. Windows at the same height as the proposed terrace opposite to the rear are some distance away and as they are rooflights within the slope of the roof they are unlikely to provide the opportunity to see the terrace. The flank wall of the side extension to the adjoining property (No. 96) is blank at this height. There is a bedroom window within the rear elevation of the adjoining property but views of the terrace from that location would be very limited. This is not a conservation area, there are similar terraces to the rear of other Hillfield Road properties and it would be difficult to see the proposed terrace from most locations. No objection to new rooflights to front or rear.

It is considered that the proposed terrace, rooflights and dormer would not be visually intrusive or have an adverse impact on the townscape or character of the building. As such the proposals would comply with UDP policies B1 and B3 and supporting Planning Guidance.

#### Amenity:

The terrace would not be excessively large, i.e. would not be able to accommodate large groups of people who together may generate noise nuisance for adjoining occupiers. The proposed 1.7m. high obscure glass screen proposed would prevent views towards the window of the adjoining premises. Views out to the rear would be to Orestes Mews towards roof lights rather than windows that could be looked into directly and the windows are more than 20m. away. The terrace would be cut into the roof slope, the balustrade would be metal and the privacy screen obscure glazed. No projections are proposed other than the balustrade and screen, as a consequence there would be no loss of daylight/sunlight to adjoining occupiers (windows or gardens).

It is considered that the proposed terrace would not have an adverse impact of the appearance of the building or local townscape, there would be no adverse amenity impact.

**Recommend** approval.

#### **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2010. For further information see

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