

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 30th November 2009. For further information see

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

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	01/12/2009
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	11/11/2009
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Elizabeth Beaumont			2009/4782/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
11 Highcroft 170 Highgate Road London NW5 1EJ			Please refer to decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Alterations to windows and doors on rear elevation following replacement of existing garage door of single dwelling house (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):	Grant planning permission			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	14	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice displayed from the 16/10/2009 to the 06/11/2009.					
	<p>Highcroft (Flats) Freehold Company – Objects for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The residents of the 8 flats and the terrace of town houses share access to and use of the courtyard. When designed each building contained an integral garage, over the years some have been converted.• Concerns with the current renovation of the building and the works being undertaken on site. No consultation from the owners. There has been chaos within the courtyard. Residents have been blocked from parking due to construction vehicles. (see below)• Concerns with green roof. (see below and 4.5)• Issues with parking due to the loss of the integral garage. (Refer to 3-3.2)• Glass doors and glass bricks impinge on the original design and appear of the rear view of the terrace and compromise of the privacy of the shared courtyard. (Refer to 4-4.4)• History of alterations on the rear elevations mainly due to permitted development rights rather than planning approval (Refer to 4.3)• Changes to rear elevation have negative impact on the original intend cohesive design. Owners have been at pains to preserve the cohesion of the front aspects. Designs that can be seen at the rear of no. 15 goes as far as is reasonable in the circumstance. (Refer to 4-4.4)• Would like to retain the secluded courtyard environment. (Refer to 4.2)• Large window design allows a much for attractive proposition to burglars. (Refer to 4.1)• No concerns with the plans for the front elevation. <p>Additional comments received on the 30/11/09 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• When parking in the courtyard the applicant is parking without permission and is aggravating the parking chaos. (Please see 3.2 and below)• The rear courtyard is laid out for permissible car and garage use only. Potential for clutter around the rear of the townhouses, together with					

	<p>social or recreational use creating activity and thus noise in the courtyard. (See below).</p> <p><u>Officer's comments</u> – <i>In relation to concerns from the construction in terms of noise and disruption - an informative would be attached to any decision notice informing the applicant of the Control of Pollution Act in relation to the hours of construction. The lack of consultation and discussion between the owners of the property with neighbouring occupiers about the proposed work is unfortunate, but is a civil matter. The Council has notified all relevant neighbours and occupiers regarding the development. Internal renovations have begun and the existing garage door has been removed. The agent has confirmed that works have ceased on the external fabric of the building. A green roof was originally proposed, however this was removed from the application prior to registration. The Council cannot prevent the use of the courtyard area by the occupants of the building.</i></p>
CAAC comments:	<p>Dartmouth Park CAAC – Objects for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Front elevations are identical with strong repetitive pattern. If the applicants were allowed to diverge from the rest of the terrace this would be damaging both to the appearance of the terrace. There is no reason why windows should not be direct replacement. Large panel in centre of the upper group of windows is unacceptable. (Please refer to paragraph 1.2) • Applicant site forms part of context of listed building. (Refer to 4-4.4) • Loss of garage space is unacceptable. Vague above current use of the garage. (Refer to paragraph 3-3.2). • No. 12 rear elevation alteration wasn't a product of any planning consent and wrecked rear elevation. An enforcement investigation is needed. (Refer to paragraph 4.3) • Work has already started on site and enforcement action will probably be necessary (see officer's comments above).

Site Description

The site is located on the south east side of Croftdown Road with a courtyard to the rear close to the corner with Highgate Road. The site comprises a terrace of 7 three storey flat-roofed buildings, some with integral garages at ground floor level accessed to the rear. The 'townhouses' are adjoined to a block of 8 flats which front onto Highgate Road. The surrounding area is mainly comprised of residential accommodation.

The building is not listed but is located in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Relevant History

Site of Sydney House No. 170 Highgate Road – 24.01.63 - p.p. granted (TP/50389) for 'the erection of a four-storey block of eight flats with six garages, and seven three-storey terrace houses each incorporating a garage, on the site of Sydney house.

12 Highcroft - 16.11.87 – p.p. refused (PL/8701141) for the use of the integral garage as additional residential floorspace, including external alterations. Allowed on appeal 22 Feb 1989.

13 Highcroft – 29.09.98 – p.p. granted (PE9800428R2) for the erection of a roof extension to provide stair enclosure . Erection of metal balustrades and formation of new roof terrace.

15 Highcroft – 24.11.00 – p.p granted (PEX0000696/R2) for the erection of metal railings and formation of a new roof terrace.

15 Highcroft – 11.01.00 – CLD approved (PE9900954) for a change of use of integral garage into a bedroom.

EN09/0780 – 18/09/2009 – enforcement investigation opened regarding a possible construction of a roof terrace. The application was closed on the 25th November as the roof was being relayed with asphalt.

Relevant policies

Adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 (Amenity for occupiers and residents), B1 (General design principles), B3 (Alterations and extensions), B7 (Conservation areas)

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement 2008

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1 Permission is sought for alterations to the rear façade following the change of use of the integral garage into a lounge involving the replacement of the existing garage door creating a kitchen and hall at ground floor level. The existing kitchen at first floor level will be converted into a study. It is proposed to replace the garage door, entrance door and part of the timber panel with glass bricks and two glass entrance doors. A new access roof light is also proposed in order to allow access to the roof for maintenance purposes.
- 1.2 The proposal also includes the replacement of the existing steel windows on the front and rear elevation with windows of the same material but with revisions to the existing symmetrical rectangular fenestration pattern and replacing the existing entrance door. This is considered unfortunate and ideally the fenestration pattern of four symmetrical panels would be retained, however this would be considered permitted development as the proposed material would be the same as existing. Therefore this is not considered as part of this application.

2. Revision

- 2.1 The proposal has been revised in order to retain the majority of the horizontal timber panel in between ground and first floor on the rear elevation in order to ensure the existing arrangement of timber/glazing is maintained.

3. Loss of Integral garage

- 3.1 Planning permission (TP/50389) was granted on the 24th January 1963 for 'the erection of a four storey block of eight flats with six garages, and seven three-storey terrace houses each incorporating a garage'. Condition 1 of specified that that 'the garages shall not be used for any purposes other than those incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house or flat, and no trade or business shall be carried on therefrom'. It is considered that the proposed use of the garage as additional accommodation for the existing dwelling house would comply with this condition and therefore does not require planning permission.
- 3.2 The applicant has confirmed that they currently park to the rear of the site in the courtyard area and are currently eligible for a resident parking permit for on-street parking. It is therefore considered that although the loss of the integral garage is unfortunate the loss of one parking space is unlikely to harm the on-street parking conditions in the area.

4. Design

- 4.1 Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement describes the property as a 1960s development on the site of Sydney House, with a block of flats and a three-storey terrace of wooden-panelled houses with flat roofs, of a scale that sits fairly neatly next its Victorian terrace neighbour. The rear elevation of the terrace of town houses overlooks the garden of the grade

II listed building at No. 3 Hillside (St Alban's Village) on Highgate Road which is part of terrace of two pairs of semi-detached villas.

- 4.2 The terrace is characterised by strips of three levels of glazing panels broken up by three levels of timber panels on the front elevation with small open porches. On the rear elevation the glazing/timber panel pattern is repeated, with a small glazing panel inserted into the timber panel in-between ground and first floor level. Originally all buildings would have had an integral garage at ground floor level.
- 4.3 The integral garages have been replaced at Nos. 12, 14 and 15 with a variety of styles of fenestration. The garage door on No. 12 has been replaced with glazing panels. At No. 14 and 15 the garage doors have been replaced with windows and a door. At No 13 the door has been replaced with a partly glazed garage door and a stable door. Planning permission has not been approved for the majority of alterations to the fenestration and façade of the properties. Prior to most recent revisions of the permitted development regulations the replacement of the garage door with windows on a single family dwelling house would not have required planning permission.
- 4.4 The rear elevation is only visible from the courtyard area to the rear. It is considered that the revised scheme which retains the overall pattern of glazing and timber panelling ensures the dwelling does not detract from the original architectural style of the terrace. It is considered that the loss of the garage door and replacement with a modern design for the façade of the building at ground floor level would not harm the character of the building or the terrace as a whole. The existing pattern of the façade of the terrace has already been altered to varying degrees on each property. Therefore it is considered that the loss of the garage door and part of the timber panel would not harm the character of the building, the setting of the nearby listed buildings, or the character and appearance of the terrace of the wider conservation area.
- 4.5 The proposed access rooflight would project approximately 0.3m from the flat roof and would not be visible from the front or rear of the property. It is therefore considered that the rooflight would not harm the character of the building or the character and appearance of the wider conservation area.

5. Amenity

- 5.1 Concerns have been raised that the introduction of a glazed rear addition would increase the levels of crime within the area. It is not considered that the glazed bricks and double glazed door would be any less secure than the existing garage door and entrance door.
- 5.2 Concerns have been received regarding the proposed impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of levels of overlooking and loss of privacy for the courtyard area. Camden Planning Guidance 2006 states that alterations should not cause an unreasonable degree of overlooking in neighbouring dwellings or private garden areas. It does not relate to shared courtyard area such as in this example. However, the glass bricks were proposed in order to allow additional light into the building while ensuring that levels of privacy for the occupiers were maintained. Therefore the views into and out of the glass blocks would

be partially obscured. The rear elevation of the property overlooks the boundary wall of No. 3 Hillside and does not allow views into any neighbouring dwellings at ground floor level. Therefore it is not considered that replacing the garage door and part of the timber panel with glazed bricks would have a detrimental impact on the privacy of any surrounding occupiers of residents in comparison to the existing situation. In order to ensure that the flat roof is not used as amenity space a condition will be attached to any decision notice to limit the use of the terrace for maintenance purposes only.

5.3 It is therefore considered that the proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the adjacent property with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook and privacy compared to the existing situation.

6. Recommendation – Grant planning permission