

**DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 05<sup>th</sup> October 2009. For further information see <http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>

<b>Delegated Report</b> Members Briefing		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	08/10/2009
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	25/09/2009
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>		
John Sheehy			2009/3670/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
52 Belsize Park Gardens London NW3 4ND			Refer to draft decision notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal</b>					
Enlargement of the existing front roof terrace.					
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Grant conditional permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	30	No. of responses	0	No. of objections	0
			No. electronic	0		
Summary of consultation responses:	Site Notice displayed from 4 <sup>th</sup> September to 25 <sup>th</sup> September.  No comments, objections or expressions of support received from neighbouring occupiers.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	Belsize CAAC, object: “Proposed terrace would be highly visible from both Belsize Park Gardens and Lambolle Place. It does not conform to the guidelines and would detract from the roofline”.					

### Site Description

A substantial 3-storey plus basement semi-detached white stucco villa located on the northern side of Belsize Park Gardens, opposite the junction with Lambolle Place. The site is located within a residential street located in the core area of the Belsize Park development undertaken in the 1860s.

Although not listed, the property has been identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area in which it is located. The property is subdivided into 6 self-contained units. This application relates to a unit on the top floor of the building.

### Relevant History

**June 1999** Planning permission granted for erection of a new front dormer and terrace and the installation of a velux rooflight to the side roofslope, ref. PW9902123R1.

## Relevant policies

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

SD6 Residential Development Standards

B1 General design principles

B3 Alterations and extensions

B7 Conservation areas

### Camden Planning Guidance 2006

### Belsize Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

**Proposal:** enlargement of the existing front roof terrace.

The roof terrace measures 2.2m wide x 1.7m long. The enlarged terrace would extend further forward towards the street and would measure 2.2m wide x 3.0m long.

The enlargement of the terrace would involve the removal of an area of the original clay tiled roof and the insertion of a glass balustrade with metal handrail to the front and both sides of the terrace.

### Revisions

While this application was under consideration, the applicant submitted revised drawings to reduce the length of the terrace from 3.2m to 2.8m. This alteration has resulted in an increase in the clearance between the terrace and the eaves from 0.50m to 0.95m.

### **Assessment:**

The principal consideration material to the determination of the application is design and the impact on the Conservation Area

### Design and Impact on the Conservation Area

#### *Background*

The proposed alteration is located at roof level on a highly sensitive main frontage within the core area of the original Belsize Park development dating from the 1860s.

The existing dormer window with railings around the roof terrace are incongruous features which harm the visual integrity of the roof. They do not form part of the original architecture of the house and are considered to clutter the front roof slope. Belsize Villas, due to their large attic spaces and flat-roofed entrance porticoes are particularly susceptible to creeping development and it would appear that planning permission was granted for these works because the proliferation of similar alterations in the surrounding area made it difficult to resist these particular proposals.

#### *Current proposal*

In the case of the current application, the proposal would be largely indistinguishable from the existing

situation because of their relatively minor scope. The detailed design, retaining a generous clearance of 0.95m to the eaves below, and the simple glass and metal hand rail would result in a discreet alteration to the building. The proposal would not involve substantial, irreversible changes to the plan or form of the building nor would it involve substantial demolition. As a result the proposal is not considered to be sufficiently harmful to justify refusal under UDP Policy B3.

A large number of properties along Belsize Park Gardens including, among others, nos. 50, 56, 73, 77 have had front roof terraces installed with railings adjacent or close to the eaves. These works, albeit not with the benefit of planning permission in all cases, have been in place for a significant period of time, perhaps over 30 years in some cases. This development has taken place on such a scale that the architectural coherence of the area has been compromised. For this reason it is considered that, on balance, the proposal, while generally discouraged, would not involve the introduction of an inappropriate alteration into a perfectly preserved set of buildings, and would not therefore be harmful enough in and of itself to justify refusal. Strictly speaking the proposal would not be inconsistent with Policy B7 as the roofs of the buildings in the immediate surrounding area have lost the integrity which contributes to the original character of Conservation Area therefore there is a diminished amount of character to preserve.

#### *Design and Conservation Area conclusion*

While the Council has reservations about the relationship of the proposal to the Conservation Area it is not considered to be sufficiently harmful to justify refusal under UDP Policy B3 or B7.

#### Other issues

There would be no loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers as a result of the proposal and the application is considered to be consistent with policy SD6.

**Recommendation:** grant conditional permission.