

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		18/06/2010	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		28/05/2010	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Jonathan Markwell				2010/1928/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
18 South Hill Park London NW3 2SB				Please see 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 rear dormer roof extension to single family dwellinghouse (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	05	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was displayed from 30/04/2010, expiring on 21/05/2010. One response has been received from an occupier at 8 Park End, specifying no objections to the application.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		South Hill Park CAAC has responded that they raise no objection to the application.					
<b>Site Description</b>							
<p>The application site building comprises a three storey and semi-basement single family dwellinghouse located on the west side of South Hill Park, close to the minor junction with Park End (to the south). Land levels at the site fall from east to west, meaning the garden area is set at a lower level than the front elevation and thus the basement floor level provides level access into the rear amenity space. The property is mid-terrace, within a group of four buildings (No's 16-22).</p> <p>Although the modest two-storey Park End workshop buildings form a buffer between the rear of the application site property and the southern part of Hampstead Heath, the roofs of No's 16-22 South Hill Park are clearly visible from parts of South End Green and public footpaths on the Heath during certain parts of the year (when the many nearby trees are not in leaf). When trees are in leaf, it is acknowledged that the application site building is not largely visible from public views, but is still visible from parts of South End Green and footpaths on the Heath.</p> <p>Although not listed, the application site building is located within South Hill Park Conservation Area.</p>							

Within the conservation area statement the building is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

### **Relevant History**

**PWX0302124** - Erection of a rear roof extension with roof terrace and installation of 2 roof lights to front roof slope, to provide additional loft accommodation for dwelling house. Refused 03/04/2003.

Reason for refusal: The proposed rear roof extension and terrace, by virtue of Guidance and South Hill Park Conservation Area Statement its prominent position, excessive bulk and size, and detailed design, would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building, the roofscape of this terrace of properties, and the character and appearance of the South Hill Park Conservation Area.

**2003/1827/P** - The erection of a rear dormer window with roof terrace and the insertion of 2 rooflights in the front roofslope, to provide additional habitable accommodation for an existing single dwellinghouse. Refused 20/10/2003.

Reason for refusal: The proposed rear roof extension and terrace, by reason of its prominent position, excessive bulk and size and detailed design, would have a detrimental effect on the appearance of the building, the roofscape of this terrace of properties, and the character and appearance of the South Hill Park Conservation Area.

An Appeal (APP/X5210/A/04/1138247) was submitted following the refusal of planning permission. The appeal was subsequently dismissed on 11/05/2004. In dismissing the appeal, the Inspector commented "by virtue of its excessive width in relation to both the rear roof and garden façade, the amount of exposed glazing, its sloping roof and its railings, would lead to it appearing over-dominant and incongruous from public vantage points and used by many people. Consequently, I conclude that it would have a detrimental impact on the existing building, the roofscape of the terrace and would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area".

**2004/4918/P** - Erection of a roof dormer and terrace plus rooflight at rear and 2 rooflights at front, to provide additional habitable accommodation for an existing single dwellinghouse. Withdrawn 23/12/2004.

**2005/1459/P** - Erection of a rear dormer window with inset roof terrace, and installation of 1 rear rooflight and 2 front rooflights, to provide additional habitable accommodation for single family dwellinghouse. Granted 27/05/2005.

### **Relevant policies**

#### **London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006**

SD1 – Quality of life

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation areas

#### **Camden Planning Guidance 2006**

#### **South Hill Park Conservation Area Statement**

#### **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*

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

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

## **Draft Development Policies**

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP29 – Improving access

## **Assessment**

### **Introduction**

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a rear dormer roof extension to this single family dwellinghouse. It is proposed to provide additional residential accommodation in the form of a bedroom, with en-suite and storage beneath the front eaves. The dormer is set in 0.5m from the ridge of the rear roofslope, 0.5m / 0.65m from the side hips and (based on section plan A020) 0.7m from the eaves. It is thus 4.3m in width, 1.9m in height (or 2.1 m including the three rooflights proposed to sit on the dormer; there is a 2.3m floor to ceiling height within the bedroom) and 2.9m in depth. It comprises two timber windows to serve a staircase and four metal framed sliding folding windows to serve the proposed bedroom. As alluded to, the dormer also included three rooflights (one serving the staircase and two the bedroom), set 0.2m above the main part of the lead clad dormer.

There appears to be an inaccuracy on the plans submitted with regard to the depth of the dormer. On the proposed section there is shown to be an area between the bottom frame of the rear dormer windows and the roofslope; this is not shown on the proposed elevation, which indicates that the bottom frame sits alongside the rear roofslope. An informative is recommended to be added to the decision notice alerting the applicant to this, with view to any future submission.

On the front roofslope one rooflight is proposed to serve the en-suite. This is set flush with the roofslope. Given the building is a single family dwellinghouse, this element is considered to constitute permitted development and is thus not assessed as part of these proposals.

### **Design**

In terms of design, it is acknowledged that within this part of South Hill Park the rear roofslopes are not unaltered and comprise a variety of roof extensions, including a number with associated roof terraces. A large number of these extensions were however approved prior to the area being designated a conservation area in 1988. The application site is situated within a terrace of four properties (No's 16-22).

It is considered that the rear elevations of this group of buildings are less exposed than those to the north overlooking the pond, but are still clearly visible from parts of South End Green and footpaths of the Heath, as verified by the Inspector in a previous appeal at the site (see relevant history above). Therefore the rooflines are considered to be prominent within the streetscape. It is also acknowledged that the neighbouring building at No. 16 (on the southern end of this terrace) includes a very unfortunate roof extension (approved in 1984 before the area was designated a conservation area – ref: 8400367), whereas the other neighbouring property (No. 20) includes a more modest dormer which is largely in accordance with the thrust of the Council's design policies. Moreover, the application site building includes a long history of applications for various roof extensions, including one application refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal and an approval from 2005 (see relevant history above). The 2005 permission comprised a rear dormer and associated inset roof terrace 2.5m in width, significantly narrower than previously refused proposals. During the site visit for this application on 25/05/2010, it was seen that this permission (which could have been implemented up to 27/05/2010) had not been implemented. It is within this context that this application is considered.

The proposed rear dormer is approximately 4.3m in width, set in 0.65m and 0.5m from the side hips / party wall boundaries with No's 16 and 20 South Hill Park. When compared with the previously approved scheme at the site and the scheme dismissed at appeal, it is considered that the width of the rear dormer roof extension is excessive in its width and therefore bulk. In dismissing a previous application at the site (see relevant history) an Inspector noted with regard to a full width rear dormer that "the proposed dormer would fail to sufficiently maintain the integrity of the existing roof form. The

dormer would neither be aligned with windows at lower levels nor would it relate well to the surface area of the roof. I consider that it would be overly wide, leaving an insufficient amount of original roof visible". When compared with the dismissed appeal, the dormer is only c.1m narrower than that proposal. In addition, from the section plan submitted, it is shown that the height of the dormer would be set in 0.5m from the ridge of the roof and 0.7m from the eaves. Therefore it is therefore considered that the proposed dormer would be overly dominant in appearance, covering the vast majority of the rear roofslope and would not maintain the integrity of the existing roof form. Given the prominence of the application site and visibility in long views from South End Green and the Heath, this would therefore cause harm to not only the host building and terrace of properties, but also the character and appearance of this part of the South Hill Park Conservation Area.

It is acknowledged that there are a variety of roof extensions in the local area, but the majority of these pre-date the designation of the area as a conservation area, and as the Inspector noted in dismissing a previous appeal at the site, these "are in parts of the street which have a different character, particularly where properties back onto the lake. In any case it is long held practice that planning proposals are judged on their individual merits and I have done so in this case".

Finally, in terms of detailed design, it is considered that the proposed dormer windows do not align comfortably with those on the floors below. It is considered that there is an over dominance of glazing proposed, with two windows (serving the staircase) being timber framed and the other four (serving the bedroom) being metal framed. The amount of glazing and contrast in materials is not considered to be appropriate in design terms and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the building and wider conservation area. In dismissing a previous appeal at the site the Inspector commented on the "substantial area of glazing would over emphasise the presence of the dormer". It is not considered that the present scheme has addressed this concern, although it is acknowledged that the amount of glazing is less than that of the dismissed appeal scheme.

### **Amenity**

The proposed rear dormer roof extension, by virtue of its location at roof level, is not considered to result in any loss of amenity for neighbouring occupiers. This is with regard to matters such as outlook/sense of enclosure, overlooking/privacy, sunlight/daylight and noise/disturbance issues. Furthermore, the proposed bedroom provides sufficient floor to ceiling height (2.3m) to provide an appropriate standard of accommodation for future occupiers.

### **Recommendation**

Refuse Planning Permission

### **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613***