

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	01/11/2007
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	15/10/2007
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Tom Webster			2007/4457/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
178D Haverstock Hill London NW3 2AL			See draft decision notice.	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Alteration of the rear roof slope to provide an inset roof terrace to the top maisonette.				
Recommendation(s):-		Refuse planning permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	32	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The neighbours were notified by letter and the consultation period expired on the 15/10/2007. No objection was received but the following comments were received:</p> <p><i>Flat B, 1 Downside Crescent</i></p> <p>“Could you please provide information on how the extension will look at I have a direct view on it and the ground flat has already built something awful in the garden. Without that piece of information it is difficult to comment more. Could you also provide the length of time of the work and their hours as my kids sleep in the room overlooking the property”</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Parkhill CAAC: <i>They object to the excessive width of the insert roof terrace, which should align with existing windows of rear elevation.</i></p>					

Site Description

The application site consists of a large four storey property with associated space within the roof. The building is not listed but is located within the Parkhill conservation area. It forms part of a group of terraced properties of identical size. The building has been subdivided into seven flats following planning permission F8/7/E/30992 being granted

Relevant History

F8/7/E/30992 - Change of use including works of conversion to form seven self-contained flats –
Granted -12/08/1980

Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

Adopted Replacement UDP (June) 2006

S1-S3 –Strategic Sustainable Development;

SD1 – Quality of Life

SD6 - Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General Design Principles

B3 –Alterations and Extensions

B7 –Conservation Areas

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Conservation Areas

Roofs and Terraces

Assessment

Planning permission is sought for the insertion of a roof terrace to the top maisonette. It will be located with the rear and will contain a combination of 7 windows/doors.

The main issues are:

1) Impact on the character and appearance of the building and the surrounding Conservation Area

2) Impact on the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers

- 1) The application property and surrounding properties all have pitched roofs, whilst a number of such properties have velux windows. What is proposed here is very much different from this form, and is considered out of keeping with the character of the area. Moreover, the width of the proposed terrace and associated alterations, combined with the height to which the alterations relate, would lead to it being visible from pedestrian level to the rear of the property, and as such, it can be viewed as being a significant alteration, and one that would disrupt the established roof form and character of the Conservation Area. In terms of impact on the parent property, the width of the terrace would radically alter the shape of the roof, particularly in terms of its width, and would be at odds with its original character. The number and shape of the proposed windows at the rear would not accord with the original fenestration on the floors below.
- 2) The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of overlooking and potential loss of privacy, as the proposed new windows look towards rooflines only. With regards to loss of daylight/sunlight, these are not considered to be an issue in this instance, as there are no windows that will be affected by the introduction of 7 rear windows. Therefore the amenities aspect of the proposal is considered acceptable.

Conclusion

The proposed development is considered unacceptable in terms of its siting, scale and design and would appear as an incongruous addition to the roofslope and as such it is considered to detract from the character of the Parkhill Conservation Area. Consequently, the proposal fails to comply with the policies listed above and supporting documentation outlined within the Camden Planning Guidance. The application is accordingly recommended for refusal.