

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	16/11/2009
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	28/10/2009
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Hugh Miller			2009/3997/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
14 Croftdown Road London NW5 1EH			Please see draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Conversion of existing roof space with associated terrace, dormer window and external staircase from existing roof terrace at second floor level to proposed roof terrace to dwelling house (Class C3).					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	16	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:	Site Notice displayed 7/10/2009, expired 28/10/2009. No response received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>	<p>Dartmouth Park CAAC: Object.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The drawings and particulars submitted plainly do not meet the minimum requirements for an application in a conservation area - no contextual information. The application should have been made invalid. They also lack sufficient detail to enable anyone to determine whether what is sought will provide a satisfactory habitable space (apart from the fact that it has to be accessed from an external staircase which is exposed to the elements). ¹ 2. Although the architectural detail of each differs, this section of Croftdown Road consists of two broadly mirrored terraces. No. 14 is in the middle of the two terraces and at the end of one. The gap between the two terraces is modest. What is proposed must, therefore, be viewed in the context of at least no. 12 and the whole of terrace of which it forms part ie 14 to 24. 3. The roofs and most of the upper rear elevations of nos. 12 to 24 are visible from the public domain as well as across the gardens. (Most of the trees will shed their leaves in winter.) 4. What is proposed plainly falls foul of the relevant provisions of DPCAAMS: Roof alterations and extensions The conservation area retains its clear historic rooflines, which it is important to preserve. Additional storeys, fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted... 5. Even without the additional terrace/balcony and the staircase necessary to reach it, the 'dormer', which accommodates a pair of doors, is huge ². When one takes account of all three very little of the original <i>main</i> ³ roof would remain visible. 6. The provision of the DPCAAMS apart, what is proposed doesn't meet the relevant provisions of the RUDP or relevant design guidance. Thus, for example, the slope of the 'dormer' is in line with that of the main roof and its apex is at the same height as 					

ridge of the main roof against the .5m of visible original roof one would expect even in a house outside the conservation area in which a modest 'dormer' might be acceptable.

7. It is a pity that applicants like this one are not alerted to the fact of the conservation area or to the provisions of DPCAAMS. This really should have happened at the pre-application discussion at the outset or when the application should have been rejected as invalid for want of contextual detail. It would save all concerned a good deal of time dealing with a so obviously hopeless an application. We don't for a moment believe what is said in the application but if it is true that a Planning Officer told the applicant that the Council would be favourably disposed and saw no problems it suggests at best a serious training deficit and at worst a wilful disregard to the legal obligation to have regard to the provisions of the DPCAAMS and the underlying duty to undertake all planning functions in a manner which at least preserves or better enhances the conservation area.

Site Description

A single family basement + 3-storey end of terrace property, located on the south side of Croftdown Road, west of Boscastle Road. The building is within Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The building is not listed.

Relevant History

No. 4 Croftdown Road - February 1988 Pp granted for the erection of dormer window to rear of roof in connection with the provision of a maisonette on the second and attic floors.

No. 20 Croftdown Road - July 1990 Pp granted for the alterations in connection with the provision of two one bedroom flats on basement and ground floors a two bedroom flat on the first floor and a three bedroom maisonette on the upper floors including the erection of a dormer window at rear roof level as shown on A01 A02A A03. revised on 14.06.90

Relevant policies

RUDP 2006:

B1 –General design principles

B3 –Alterations and extensions

B7 –Conservation areas

SD1 - Quality of life

SD6 - Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

CPG 2006: section 41: Roof and terraces.

Dartmouth Park C.A. Statement: Roof extensions –DP24; DP25; DP26.

Assessment

1.0 Background

1.1 The application building has no relevant planning history. However, within the two groups of terraced properties (nos. 2- 12 & 14-24) there are two properties (nos. 4 & 20 Croftdown Rd) with roof extensions at the rear roof slope. Both properties have full-width dormer roof extensions with no.20 incorporating a roof terrace on the dormer roof. The extensions have been in existence for 19 and 21 years.

1.2 Additionally, at the rear, rooflights and roof terraces at 2nd floor level are common features of the houses between nos. 2 -24. At the second floor level no. 18 has a timber pergola structure.

The application proposes the following:

- Conversion of existing roof space with associated terrace, dormer window and external staircase from existing roof terrace at second floor level to proposed roof terrace to dwelling house.

2.0 Design

The main issues are the design, and how this may impact upon the character and appearance of the host property and wider Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

2.1 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.”*

2.2 The proposed dormer would not include a window, but rather French doors comprising timber framed and glazed to match the existing rear doors. It would be 1.8m wide and 2.5m high. The Camden Planning Guidance recommends a minimum 500mm gap between the proposed dormer, the roof ridge, roof hip and eaves. The proposal would not comply with these guidelines. The ridge of the proposed dormer would be the same height as the main roof. The proposed dormer window would not maintain a 500mm gap with the edge of the main roof. This would result in an overly dominant, contrived and bulky addition to the roof and would harm the character and appearance of the host building and wider Conservation Area.

2.3 The proposed addition of a roof terrace and external staircase would exemplify the large and bulky appearance of the proposal. The staircase would not appear subordinate to the original building in terms of scale or situation and the form proportions and character of the building would be harmed. The staircase and roof terrace would exacerbate the prominent appearance of the proposed dormer window and would harm the character and appearance of the host property and wider area.

2.4 The proposed fenestration of the dormer would not be subordinate to the fenestration of the existing building at lower levels. This would result in a dominant form of development which would not maintain the hierarchy of fenestration (more subordinate fenestration at the upper levels) within the design of the host building and neighbouring properties. The proposal is considered to be disproportionately large due to the shallow-pitched roof of the host building and would be contrary to CPG.

2.5 Notwithstanding the existing roof extension (no.20) within the terrace, the roofscape remains largely unimpaired by roof extensions and the proposed dormer and associated staircase would interrupt the roofscape. Moreover, the host building and terrace have a roof profile that is exposed to important views from the public realm, Boscastle Road, due east. The proposal would be visually dominant and would detract from the roofscape. This would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area

2.6 Paragraph 3.31 of the Councils UDP states that, 'Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions'. This is considered to be important when considering the two existing dormer windows in the area which were constructed in 1989 and 1990. The current Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement lists, nos. 2-64 Croftdown Road as making a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. In the wider interest of the area, it is imperative therefore, that the special interest of these buildings is preserved.

2.7 Paragraph 3.32, recognises that overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Additionally, paragraph 3.34 states "...some roof alterations and extensions to individual roofs need to be treated with sensitivity, such as"where the topography or alignment of the streets allow views of the rooflines, rooftops, projecting party wallsor"where streets retain the original roofline of their buildings, it is important that these are preserved in an unaltered form".

2.8 The policy justifications go on to amplify that "*extensions to roofs will not always be acceptable. There will be situations, which are particularly sensitive to roof extensions...such as where a street retains its original unaltered roofline. It is therefore important to preserve the roofs unaltered where this occurs*". In principle therefore, a roof extension would be unacceptable.

2.9 There is an existing roof terrace (2nd floor level) and the proposed spiral staircase including balustrade would provide external access, linking both terraces. In this location, it is considered that both the roof terrace and staircase are discordant elements, visually intrusive and would detract from the appearance of the host building and the wider Dartmouth Park Conservation Area generally.

2.10 The proposal is contrary to CPG roof alterations guideline and the Dartmouth Park C.A. Statement guidelines, which discourages dormers on buildings which remains largely, but not necessarily completely, unimpaired.

2.11 As proposed, the roof extension, terrace and associated staircase are considered to be unsatisfactory and would detract from the character and appearance of the application building and those adjacent. It would be contrary to policies B1 and B3.

3.0 Amenity

3.1 At the second floor level rear, the host building has an existing roof terrace with balustrade, which is characteristic of the properties within the terrace. In this instance, the proposed dormer and roof terrace would not raise any new overlooking issues and is satisfactory. Nevertheless, the proposal is considered unacceptable for the reasons set out above.

Recommendation Refuse.

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