

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		29/07/2010	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		13/7/2010	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Hugh Miller				2010/2984/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
17 Highgate West Hill London N6 6NP				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>							
Installation of 1 dormer window to rear roofslope of existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3)							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Householder Application</b>					
<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>04</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
				No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Site Notice displayed 18/6/2010, expires 9/7/2010. No response.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		<u>Highgate CAAC</u> : Object.  The proposed dormers would cause overlooking and set an unfortunate precedent where nearby roofs do not have dormers.  <i>Officer Comment: See paras. 2.1-3.1 below.</i>					

## Site Description

A basement + 3-storey terrace single-family dwellinghouse with single-storey rear closet wing which is situated on the west side of Highgate West Hill, north of the junction with Millfield Lane. The building is within Highgate conservation area. It is not listed.

## Relevant History

May 2010 – PP refused - Installation of 2 dormer windows to rear roofslope of existing house (Class C3); ref. 2010/1228/P.

February 2010 – Certificate of Lawfulness Refused - Erection of a new dormer extension at rear to dwelling house (Class C3), ref. 2009/5837/P.

February 2010 – Pp granted - Erection of rear glazed extension at basement and ground floor levels, excavation of rear garden including the creation of new patio levels, new glazed door and window plus new access steps between basement and ground level (Class C3); ref. 2009/5795/P

## Relevant policies

### **RU DP 2006:**

- SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
- B1 – General design principles
- B3 – Alterations and extensions
- B7 – Conservation areas

### **CPG 2006:**

- Section 19 – Extensions, alterations and conservatories;
- Section 29 –Overlooking and privacy.

Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Statement adopted 12/12/07

### ***Draft LDF Core Strategy***

*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*
- CS6 – Providing quality homes*
- CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage / conservation areas*
- DP24 – Securing high quality design*
- DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas*
- DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours*

*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.*

## Assessment

### 1.0 Preamble

1.1 In February 2010, the Council refused to issue a Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Development for the erection of a new dormer extension to the rear roof of the dwelling house (Class C3), because the building is located within the Highgate Conservation Area, i.e. Not in compliance with Schedule 2 Part1, Class B of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (No. 2) (England) Order 2008.

1.2 Approval was however granted for a double height glazed extension at the rear. To date, this has not been implemented.

1.3 In May 2010, planning permission was refused for the "Installation of 2 dormer windows to rear roofslope of existing house" for reason as follows:

*The proposed rear dormer windows, by reason of their design, size, and siting, would create prominent and discordant features within the roofscape of the host building and of the overall terrace of buildings at nos 15-22 Highgate West Hill. They would harm the appearance of this building, the setting of the adjacent buildings and the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.*

1.4 The current application originally proposed a single dormer window of contemporary design, positioned off-centred on the rear roof slope. It had dimensions of 3.2m width x 2.05m height x 2.8m depth. It had an inset roof terrace, glazed balustrade; double-glazed timber framed folding doors with zinc cladding to its roof and cheeks.

1.5 Following discussions with the agent, the scheme was revised to address issues related to the dormer in particular its detailed design and setting with the rear roofslope. The revised drawings show alterations as follows:

- ✓ slated apron replace inset roof terrace and glazed balustrade;
- ✓ windows with glazing bars added to replace timber framed folding doors;
- ✓ dormer window lowered in height with increase gap between the dormer roof and the apex of the main roof.

The main issues are **a)** design, **b)** the impact upon the character and appearance of the host property and wider Highgate Conservation Area; **c)** neighbour amenity.

### 2.0 Design

2.1 Houses no.15-18 on the west side of Highgate West Hill comprises a group of 4 properties, forming a bookend and comprising shallow hipped roofs. Of the 4 properties only no.15 has a dormer on the rear roofslope, which was granted approval in 1984 (26 years ago) under different policies, and guidelines. Further north of the application site are other groups of semi-detached properties nos. 19 - 22, with no dormers. Nos.23-27 have dormer windows that vary in detailed design, size and setting on the roofslope; notwithstanding, the houses generally form distinct groups as noted by the Conservation Area Statement and in particular include distinct roof profiles. The houses all positively contribute to the character of the CA. The group within which the application property lies (nos.15-18) as well as the uphill group of semi-detached properties (19-22) has a roofline largely unimpaired by roof alterations and extensions. In contrast, nos 24-26 have large dormers which are referred to by the CAS as negative features marring the roofscape.

2.2 The dormer window, as revised during the course of the application, is 3.2m in width. This is considered to be satisfactory given the overall width of the property. It will be set back from the existing chimneys on the side elevations (nos. 16 & 18) by 1.2m & 1.7m, while also being set 1.4m from the roof eaves. Together with the altered detail design of increased slated apron and windows with glazing bars as replacement for folding doors, the revised dormer would not be overly dominant; neither would it detract from the appearance of the host building. Moreover, the size, height and location would ensure that it would not be visibly dominant from the public domain. It would be partially screened by mature trees rear of the application site. Thus in this location the extension would not have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the host building or wider conservation area.

2.3 Furthermore, when compared with the previously refused scheme and that originally proposed by this application, the current proposals are considered to be more sympathetic in its detailed design, setting and appearance within the roofscape of the host building.

2.4 It is also noted that the dormer would only be set 250mm below the main roof apex. Although this gap is less than the CPG minimum (500mm), the overall impact would not be so materially harmful to refuse the proposal. It is considered to have a minimal visual impact, partially given the aforementioned context of the location on the rear elevation of the property. It is also acknowledged that the applicant has minimised as far as possible the floor to ceiling height of the dormer to 2.1m. In overall terms the proposed dormer is not considered to cause harm to the appearance of the host building, the roofscape in both long and short views from

Millfield Lane or Millfield Place and the wider Highgate Conservation Area. Thus, following revisions, the dormer is considered to be satisfactory in design.

### **3.0 Neighbour amenity**

3.1 The proposed dormer window is not considered to cause harm to neighbour amenity because:

- ✓ the dormer would be set back 1.4m from the eaves and at such acute angle, the occupiers would not be able to see into the adjacent habitable rooms at nos.16 or 18; therefore no harm would occur in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy;
- ✓ the dormer would be located in excess of 20m from no.1 Millfield Place which lies due west of the host building and is partially obscured by conifers, which forms the boundary between the rear garden and Millfield Place; moreover, CPG suggest that windows at a distance of 18m is considered to be an acceptable distance to not cause harm in terms of impact on neighbour amenity. In this instance, the proposed windows would not raise any new overlooking issues and is satisfactory. The proposal accords with policy SD6 and CPG guidelines.

Recommendation: Approve.

#### **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 26<sup>th</sup> July 2010. For further information see**

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

