

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		04/05/2010	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		8/4/2010	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Hugh Miller				2010/1228/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
17 Highgate West Hill London N6 6NP				Refer to decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Installation of 2 dormer windows to rear roofslope of existing house (Class C3)							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site Notice displayed 17/3/21010, expires 7/4/2010. No response					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		<u>Highgate CAAC</u> : Object. The proposed dormers would cause overlooking and set a bad precedent and would cause damage to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.					

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

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

RUDP 2006:

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

SD7A – Light pollution

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 12/07

Rear Extensions.

South Hill Park Conservation Area Statement 2009:

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

This application proposes the following:

- ✓ Installation of 2 dormer windows to rear roof slope of existing house (Class C3)

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

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 also granted for a double height glazed extension at the rear. Not implemented.

2.0 Design

Houses no.15-18 on the west side of Highgate West Hill comprises a group of 4 properties. Nos. 15 and 18 form a bookend and comprise 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 with 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 which refers to them as negative features marring the roofscape.

The dimensions of the proposed dormers are as follows:

Original – width 1.6m and 2.3m; Revised - 1.4m and 2.1m.

Following discussions with the agent, the scheme was revised as noted above to address issues related to the dormers in particular, their detailed design, size and setting with the rear roofslope. The revised drawings showed a minor reduction in width of the proposed dormer windows. It is also noticeable that there is a slight increased gap between the dormer window adjacent to the chimney and upstand with no.18 on the north side, but not large enough to comply with CPG roof extension guidelines, which require a 500mm gap. Even allowing for the revision, the dimensions of the proposed dormers are considered to be excessive in their scale and proportions, this is exemplified by the shallow pitched roof. Only 1 or 2 dormers of smaller size would be acceptable, but this would not provide adequate internal headroom height. The detailed design of the roof extension including the proposed window types, their scale and proportions are considered unacceptable, detracting from the appearance of the subject building and those adjacent. The introduction of such a roof extension would be a discordant element, detracting from the roofscape and group value of the properties. The proposed roof extension would give the building an unacceptable amount of additional bulk.

The proposed roof extension is considered unacceptable for reasons as follows:

- the properties within the group nos. 15-22 have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, The sole large dormer at no.15 predates current policy and guidelines and does not set a precedent.
- the existing roof is shallow-pitched and to allow adequate headroom for habitable space would result in the creation of disproportionately large and high dormers which fail to comply with CPG guidelines that require a gap of 500mm from ridge, eaves, hip and party walls; in

particular it results in the coalescing of the lefthand dormer with the party wall with no.18 and a 250mm narrow gap between the dormer roof and the roof ridge of the main building; due to the position of the staircase, the left hand dormer cannot be physically separate from the party wall.

- the roof extension would add significant bulk and massing to the host building and unbalance the architectural composition. The windows are larger than those below, both in actual size and perceived size, due to their dimensions and lack of glazing bar subdivisions. In terms of design, scale, and pane size, the proposed dormer windows would not relate to windows on the façade below and to the surface area of the roof and they would not be subordinate within the roofscape. One centrally placed dormer or 2 much smaller ones would be preferred which relate better to the window proportions, positions and designs below. The design is also unorthodox in that the dormers have planting troughs in front which are inset within the roofslope, and these create a discordant feature.
- the host building and terrace have a roof profile that is exposed to views from the public realm, Millfield Place.
- the dormers by virtue of their size and position would disrupt the form and profile of the existing roof of the building and of the terrace of properties here; the resultant effect would harm the character and appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area, in conflict with UDP policy B7.

Policy justification to policy B3, Paragraph 3.31 states *“Alterations and extensions can allow buildings to be enlarged, adapted and used more flexibly. They also can help make more efficient use of scarce land in the Borough. However, if they are poorly designed, alterations and extensions can cause harm to the appearance of a building and the character of the surrounding area. Alterations and extensions should follow the form, proportions and character of the building to which they relate.”* It continues *“Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street. Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations or extensions.”*

Policy justification to policy B3, paragraph 3.32, recognises that overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Additionally, paragraph 3.34 states that there will be situations which are especially sensitive to roof additions and alterations, such as ...”where the topography or alignment of the streets allow views of the rooflines, rooftops, projecting party walls” and also states that ”where streets retain the original roofline of their buildings, it is important that these are preserved in an unaltered form”.

Views of the roof of the property looking north east from Millfield Lane and Millfield Place are partly screened by trees, although it is accepted that the conifers in due course could be replaced by deciduous trees allowing more views through. In any event, the roof is visible from Millfield Place and from this location the dormers would be clearly seen projecting beyond the roof slopes and impacting on the skyline.

CPG give further guidance as to where roof alterations and extensions are likely to be unacceptable, including groups of buildings that have a roofline that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions. It also gives further guidance on design and location of dormers where the principle is deemed acceptable and suggests that dormers should not be introduced on shallow pitched roofs.

Additionally, the Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy states in relation to roof alterations and extensions- *“The Conservation Area retains many diverse historic rooflines which it is important to preserve. Fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers, or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will not be acceptable”*. It appears from this statement that the principle of dormers in this terrace is not necessarily objectionable but rather their design and size.

In this case, the proposal is considered contrary to CPG roof alterations guidelines and the Highgate C.A. Statement guidelines, which discourage inappropriately designed and prominently sited and

sized dormers on buildings, especially buildings in groups which form part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset. The statement which also states that houses nos. 15-30 makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the Highgate Conservation Area.

As proposed, the roof extension is unsatisfactory and would detract from the application building and those adjacent. It is contrary to policies B1, B3, B7, as well as guidance in the CPG and Highgate C.A. Statement.

Neighbour amenity

The proposed dormer windows would not cause harm to neighbour amenity because:

- the dormers 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 dormers 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 DS6 and CPG guidelines. Nevertheless, the proposal is considered unacceptable for the reasons set out above.

Refusal is recommended.

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