

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>24/05/2010</b>	
<b>(Members Briefing)</b>		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>28/04/2010</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Elizabeth Beaumont				2010/1362/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
100 South Hill Park, London, NW3 2SN				Please refer to 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 enlarged front, side and rear dormers including an inset roof terrace in rear roof slope and the installation of three rooflights and two solar panels on the side roofslope, all for single family dwellinghouse (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>02</b>	No. of responses	<b>02</b>	No. of objections	<b>02</b>
			No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p><b>These comments were submitted prior to the revisions to the scheme;</b></p> <p><b>104 South Hill Park</b> (same letter submitted 3 times) – objects for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With respect to the refurbishment, energy conservation and solar panels are welcomed.</li> <li>• Concerns if the size of the balcony. We can see the effect of the very large roof balconies in the houses overlooking the lower pond and in those at the top of the loop of South Hill Park. (Refer to 2.1 and 3.7)</li> <li>• The proposal would overlook the garden of no. 102 and that its edge would be within the party wall. (Refer to 4-4.3)</li> <li>• The proposal should be in keeping with the roofline of this exception row of houses overlooking the middle pond. (Refer to 3.7)</li> </ul> <p><b>102 South Hill Park</b> (same letter received twice) – objects for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is proposed to create a terrace not a Juliet balcony. The drawings are incorrect and inaccurate</li> <li>• Impact on amenity; (<i>Please refer to 4-4.4</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Harm privacy and security</li> <li>○ Noise disturbance adjacent to my bedroom window.</li> <li>○ Privacy – could lean round the wall and look into the window.</li> <li>○ Overlooking into the garden at 102.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Security – people could climb from dormer at 100 into 102. (<i>Refer to 4.4</i>)</li> <li>• Impact on character and appearance; (Refer to 2.1 and 3-3.7) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Other large dormers within the street were constructed long before existing planning policies were imposed.</li> <li>○ The purpose is not designed to a high standard, does not respect its setting or the attractiveness of the area.</li> <li>○ The dormers do not relate to windows below.</li> <li>○ Rear dormer will dominate the rear elevation and is wider than those on lower floors and won't appear as a small projection from the roof surface.</li> <li>○ The presence of unsuitable dormer will not serve as a precedent for development of the same kind.</li> <li>○ Terrace will break through the roof profile.</li> <li>○ At no. 106 (2007/3028/P) the terrace was set into the roof slope.</li> <li>○ The property is located in a beauty spot facing the ponds. There are no similar situations to the one proposed. The development will harm views of the application property and the wider conservation area.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p><b>South Hill Park CAAC</b> – objects for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The elevation to South Hill Park proposed dormer would be acceptable if it's identical to the other half of the semi. Refer to 3-3.6)</li> <li>• To the rear overlooking the Heath we have no objection to the Juliet balcony in the context of the neighbours.</li> <li>• We object to the dormer proposed to the side elevation which prevents an ugly invasion to the skyline. (Refer to 2.1 and 3.4-3.5)</li> </ul> <p><b>The Heath &amp; Hampstead Society</b> – object for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• House is prominently sited overlooking the Heath and comes therefore into the category of development on the fringes of the Heath. The proposal for more and increased size of dormer windows and viewing balconies are badly conceived and designed and would obtrude into views of the house from the Heath. (Refer to 2.1 and 3-3.6)</li> <li>• Object to the loss of the two existing small dormer, a pretty original feature dating back to the construction of the house and the enormous side facing dormer. (Refer to 3.1)</li> <li>• None are designed to align with or have design correlation with existing windows. The proposal would damage views from this popular area of the Heath. (Refer to 3-3.6)</li> </ul>					

## Site Description

The site is located on the northwest side of South Hill Park and backs on to the No. 2 Pond on Hampstead Heath. The site comprises a three storey semi-detached family house with lower ground floor level. The property is not listed but is located in the South Hill Park Conservation Area in a predominately residential area. The building is identified as a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

## Relevant History

None relevant

## Relevant policies

### Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 (Amenity for occupiers and neighbours), SD9 (Resources and Energy), 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

CS1 (Distribution of growth), CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development), CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards), CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage), DP22 - Promoting sustainable design and construction, DP24 (securing high quality design), DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage), 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. Proposal

1.1. Permission is sought for the following;

- A front dormer window measuring 1.85m wide, 2.2m deep and 1.5m high with timber framed window.
- Erection of a rear dormer measuring 2.25m wide, 1m deep and 1.5m high with an inset roof terrace.
- Rebuilding the side dormer to match existing (0.8m wide, 1.4m high sloping up to 1.7m and 3m deep).
- Installation of three conservation rooflights on the side roofslope. .
- Erection of two solar panels on the side roofslope (0.7m by 1.5m)

### 2. Revisions

2.1. The proposal was revised during the course of the application as follows;

- Reduce the scale of the front dormer.
- Reduction in the scale of the side dormer to match the existing dormer window. As a consequence three rooflights (not originally proposed) are now proposed.
- Inset the proposed roof terrace within the slope of the roof removing the metal balustrade and in effect reducing the depth of original proposed terrace.

### 3. Design

#### Loss of original feature

3.1. The rear elevations of the properties along South Hill Park have become more informal over time. South Hill Park Conservation Area Statement identifies that the "unique relationship of the dwellings to Parliament Hill and the Heath is a principal feature of the conservation area." The rear elevations of this side of South Hill Park are readily visible from the heath and have undergone numerous alterations including a range of extensions at roof level. The application site and its neighbour have what appear to be original small peaked roof dormer windows. No. 102 only has the original side dormer remaining with large front and rear dormers. The application site has original front, rear and side dormers. The proposal would involve the loss of these architectural features to the front and rear of the property with the shape and position of the side dormer being replicated. While their loss is considered unfortunate it is considered that given the front and rear roofslopes of the other pair and buildings within the street have a variety of additions at roof level it would difficult to insist of their retention. The proposed side dormer is being rebuild to a similar design as existing which will reinstate some symmetry to the pair.

3.2. The CPG 2006 recommends that dormer windows should relate to the façade below and the surface area of the roof and should appear as separate small projections from the roofslope. South Hill Park Conservation Area Statement states that dormers at the front and the side will not be allowed where a cluster of roofs remain largely unimpaired. The other building within the pair has a large dormer on the front and rear elevation with a small side dormer that is likely to be original of the same size as that located on the application site.

#### Front dormer

- 3.3. The proposed front dormer is positioned 0.9m from the eaves, 0.5m from the ridge and the parapet with the neighbouring property but only 0.3m from the corner of the dormer to the hip following revisions during the course of the application. Although not in full compliance with the CPG 2006 the dormer would be aligned with the neighbouring dormer. This is considered to be acceptable given the balance this creates between the two properties. The dormer is wider than the window below but aligns with general position of the window on the lower floor. There are a number of examples of dormers comprising a variety of bulk, scales and designs on the front roof slopes of similar properties in the street. It is therefore considered that following the revisions to the scale of the dormer it would be acceptable.

#### Side dormer

- 3.4. The side dormer will be rebuilt to follow the design principles of the existing dormer with a peaked roof and timber framed window, reducing the overall bulk and scale of the originally proposed replacement dormer. The dormer will be rebuilt in the same position as the existing dormer. It is considered that given as the proposed side dormer follows the principles of existing original feature it raises no design issues.
- 3.5. The proposed conservation style rooflights on the side roofslope would allow light into the proposed loft room and stairwell. The rooflights would be set almost flush to the roofslope in accordance with the CPG 2006. One of the rooflights is positioned closer to the rear elevation of the property so would be visible from the rear. There are a number of conservation rooflights on neighbouring properties therefore it is considered that given that it would be flush to the roofslope it would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the building or views of the building from the Heath. Two further rooflights are proposed in the centre of the roof close to the eaves following the reduction in the scale of the extension. The visibility of these features would be limited and are considered acceptable. Moreover given the rooflights will not protrude more than 150mm beyond the plane of the roof it is likely that they could be installed under permitted development for this single dwelling house.
- 3.6. The proposal to install two solar panels on the side roofslope is welcomed and encouraged by policy SD9 and is also considered acceptable in terms of overall visual impact. The proposed solar panels would be positioned in the centre of the roofslope above two of the rooflights. The side roof slope is only visible in short views from South Hill Park due to the height of the building and proximity to the neighbouring property and would be obscured from views to the rear by the side dormer. It is considered that although the panels would be visible in short 'chance' views they would not detract from the character of the building or the character and appearance of the conservation area.

#### Rear dormer

- 3.7. The rear dormer is slightly off-set in terms of its position from the window on the floor below. However this would mirror the position of the existing neighbouring dormer and is therefore considered acceptable in this context. The dormer is 1.2m up from the eaves, 0.3m from the hip and 1.5m from the ridge in general compliance with the CPG 2006. The window is slightly larger than the second floor window and it is proposed to install sliding doors on the rear dormer in order to allow access to the terrace. There are a number of examples of dormers with a variety of bulk, scale and designs on the rear elevation. The CPG 2006 states that the presence of unsuitably designed new or altered dormers in neighbouring properties should not serve as a precedent for further development of the same kind. In this proposal the roof terrace following revisions is in general accordance with the guidance set out in the CPG and would be set behind a roof apron of tiles above the eaves and is no wider than the dormer opening. There are a number of examples of rear dormers and terraces with full railings at this part of South Hill Park. There is no record of planning permission being obtained for these developments. However it is considered that following the reductions negotiated during the course of the application the amount of visual clutter at roof level would be minimal. The use of the roof apron above the eaves as a balustrade serves to reduce the visual bulk of the proposed dormer. Therefore on balance, no design issues are raised with this element of the proposals.

### **4. Amenity**

- 4.1. Concerns have been raised in regards to the impact on the terrace on the neighbouring occupier in terms of noise levels and possible overlooking and loss of privacy.

#### Noise disturbance

- 4.2. The proposed roof terrace would be set approximately 1m back from the edge of the brick parapet wall (2.5m high) which acts as a boundary wall between the two properties (no. 100 and 102). It is considered that although the terrace would be 0.6m from the window on the rear dormer at no.102 due to limited size of the terrace, the brick boundary wall and that the terrace is inset behind the roof slope, it would be sufficient to ensure that the terrace would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of this neighbouring occupier or others in the area.

#### Overlooking/loss of privacy

- 4.3. A number of concerns have been raised in regards to the potential level of overlooking from the proposed terrace at roof level. It is considered that given the limited depth of the terrace at roof level any views back onto the rear elevation or down into the garden of the neighbouring property would be extremely limited. The front, side and rear dormers follow the removal of existing dormers. It is therefore considered that the development would not introduce significant new levels of overlooking in comparison to the existing situation and therefore would be

considered acceptable.

Security

- 4.4. Concerns have been raised that the creation of a dormer would decrease the security for the neighbouring property. It is considered that the proposed dormer would have a negligible impact on security given that the terrace would be inset into the roofslope. This combined with the large brick parapet is considered to be sufficient to ensure that the dormer does not affect the security of the property.

**5. Recommendation - Grant 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*