

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Tuesday 25th March 2008. 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:	25/03/2008
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	18/03/08
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Katrina Christoforou			2008/0726/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
71 Roderick Road London NW3 2NP			See decision notice.	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of a rear dormer to single family dwelling.				
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	06	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. Electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was erected on the 26/02/08 and six neighbours were individually consulted. By the end of the consultation period one objection had been received. <u>Objection:</u> Concerned about falling debris from the building works. <u>Response:</u> Not a material consideration.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	Mansfield CAAC were consulted and object to the scheme on the following grounds: The proposed dormer does not comply with SPG as it is not set down 0.5m from the roof ridge or one third up from the gutter. <u>Response:</u> The proposed dormer meets SPG standards in terms of its distance from the eaves. The dormer is set down 0.3m from the roof ridge. A distance of 0.5m is suggested in the SPG. In this case it would be impossible to achieve the necessary head height if the dormer was lowered. This was discussed with the applicant's architect following the refusal of the previous application and it was decided that a distance of 0.3m would be satisfactory in this case provided the overall size of the dormer was reduced, as it has now been for this application (see assessment for more details).					

Site Description

The three storey single family dwelling house is the penultimate property in the Victorian terrace on the west side of Roderick Road, within the Mansfield Conservation Area. The rear of the property backs onto the rear of the parallel terrace along Lisburne Road and is visible from the public realm in Constantine/Savernake Road to the north.

Relevant History

PEX0100581: Erection of two dormer windows to roof at rear elevation in connection with loft conversion. GRANTED 14/01/2002 with the standard 5 year condition. Permission therefore expired on the 14/01/2007.

2007/5793/P: Erection of a rear dormer to single family dwelling. Refused 07/01/08.

The 2002 permission was involved a dormer directly above the eaves in the corner of the rear roof slope. This scheme was granted prior to the adoption of the Replacement UDP and supplementary guidance and would no longer be acceptable but the works were not undertaken and the permission has now expired.

The application refused 07/01/08 included a larger dormer than the current scheme. The application was refused on the grounds that its size, bulk, position and detailed design, would create an excessively bulky roof feature that would harm the appearance of the host property and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Based upon the refusal and subsequent discussions the scheme has now been revised and the current application has been submitted.

Relevant policies

Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6- Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1- General design principles

B3- Alterations and extensions

B7- Conservation Areas

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Assessment

The proposal is for the installation of a rear dormer and four rooflights, two in the front roof slope and two at the rear. The dormer would be centrally located in the horizontal of the roofslope and would be set down from the roofline by 0.3m and up from the eaves by 0.6m. The slate hung dormer with a single double glazed timber sash window would be 1.9m high by 1m wide and would have a maximum depth of 3m from the original roofslope.

The majority of the rear roofslope of the terrace is visible from the public realm in the adjacent Constantine/Savernake Road. A number of rooflights have been installed on the neighbouring properties and a dormer at number 61 four houses down, which appears to have been installed without planning permission, possibly under permitted development prior to the designation of the conservation area. The adjoining end of terrace property, number 73 has seen a recent three storey rear extension which includes dormers in its mansard style roof. Given the context, the principle of a dormer in this location would be acceptable. As the proposed dormer is of a much more modest size than that of the refused scheme its impact upon the host building and the terrace would not be as great. The addition would be subordinate to the bulk and mass of the host property. As the bulk and dominance of the dormer has been reduced its height becomes less of an issue as the overall impact is not as great. If the dormer were able to be set down an additional 0.2m to bring the proposal fully in line with the SPG it is unlikely to make a dramatic difference to the built appearance in this case. The materials and style of the window would be in keeping with the existing and the central position is considered to be appropriate. The new dormer would not therefore harm the character and appearance of the host property or the conservation area.

The four rooflights, two on the front and two at the rear (one on either side of the dormer) would be positioned symmetrically towards the upper part of the roof and would be of conservation style. The roof form would be unaltered by the rooflights and they are therefore permitted development.

The rooflights and the dormer would be at a sufficient distance and angle from any neighbouring windows ensuring that overlooking or a loss of privacy would not occur.

Recommendation:

The proposals are considered to be broadly in line with policies SD6, B1, B3 and B7 and the application is therefore recommended for approval.