

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		01/05/2014	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		26/05/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Obote Hope				2014/2240/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
73 Parkhill Road London NW3 2XY				Please refer to decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Enlargement of side dormer and installation of rear dormer and roof light to front of the house.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Consent					
Application Type:		Householder Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	02	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
				No. Electronic	02		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notice displayed from 04/04/2014 until 01/05/2014 Press notice displayed from 10/04/2014 until 26/05/2014					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		Parkhill CAAC raised the following Objection below, which was logged twice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Side dormer too prominent as the house is in effect on a corner site – too near the roof edge back dormer excessive and out of character to the art deco building”. 					
Site Description							
The site comprises a three storey with basement and converted loft space, mid-terrace residential building containing flats two maisonettes and 1 self-contained flat. The building is located on the north side of Steeles Road, west of Haverstock Hill. The building is located in the Eton Conservation Area. <p>The proposed site is noted as a building which makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. The proposed site is within a group of seven terraces that has a mixture of design of dormer windows to the front elevation.</p>							

Relevant History

G9/13/46/34573(R2) - Change of use and works of conversion to create 2 self-contained maisonettes and 1 self-contained flat including the erection of a 2 storey rear extension and the formation of a rear roof terrace. **Granted** on 15th October 1982.

November 2007 – PP Granted - Installation of dormer windows in side and rear elevation and Velux windows in the front and rear elevation of the existing dwelling; ref. **2007/4083/P**.

2013/7296/P – LDC (Proposed) - Erection of dormer roof extension to rear and side of dwelling. Withdrawn **16/01/2014**

2012/1950/P – PP- Retention of a new railings and gates to front garden boundary of dwelling house. Refused and warning of enforcement **12/06/2012**

Adjoining properties

83 Parkhill Road

2006/3300/P- Planning permission was granted on **13/09/2006** for additions and alterations at roof level including enlarged side dormer window and new rear dormer window to dwellinghouse (Class C3).

85 Parkhill Road

2007/3589/P- Planning permission was granted on **17/09/2007** for construction of a dormer in the rear roof slope of single-family dwelling

91 Parkhill Road

PEX0100555 - Planning permission was granted on **21/08/2001** for alterations to roof at rear of property to accommodate a habitable room including four Velux windows.

93 Parkhill Road

2006/2266/P - Planning permission was granted on **07/07/2006** for the addition of rear dormer and enlargement of side dormer to dwelling house (Class C3).

2014/1041/P - Erection of rear dormer, enlargement of side dormer and installation of front rooflight. Refused 05/06/2014 for the following reason: The proposed new dormers, by virtue of their scale, proportions and siting, would appear as an incongruous and unsympathetic additions to the roof of the host property, resulting in unacceptable harm to its appearance, and fails to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the unity of the group of buildings and wider conservation area, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and to policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)
DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance 2013

CPG1 (Design) Ch 1-3 & 5
CPG6 (Amenity) Ch 1 & 5-9

Parkhill and Upper Park conservation area appraisal and management 2011

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

Assessment

1.0 Background

1.1 Planning permission was originally sought for the erection of a rear dormer extension, the enlargement of the side dormer extension and a new roof light to the front elevation in November 2013 the application was applied for by the agent on the grounds that the proposed works would be lawful by submitting a Lawful Development Certificate (Proposed).

1.2 The main issues for consideration are:

- 1) The design and impact of the development on the existing building and the character and appearance of the Parkhill Conservation Area.
- 2) The impact of the development on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

2.0 Design and impact on the Eton Conservation Area

2.1 Policy DP24 of the LDF states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a) *character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;*
- b) *the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;*
- c) *the quality of materials to be used;*

2.2 In addition, paragraph 24.13 states, “*Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings. (...) Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions*”.

2.3 Policy DP25 of the LDF states that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area. Paragraph 5.6 of CPG 1 (Design) states that roof extensions and alterations are likely to be unacceptable where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.

2.4 While it is acknowledged that there are a number of unsympathetic dormers in the surrounding area, this particular site is located at end of terrace and its roof is visible and prominent in the public realm. The location of the dormers so close to the edges of the roof would result in overly excessive and bulky roof extensions in terms of their scale and proportions.

2.5 The Parkhill Conservation Area Appraisal advises that “proposals for dormers within the conservation area will be considered on their own merit. Dormer extension may be allowed at the rear, subject to Camden Planning Guidance (CPG). Particular care is needed to ensure sensitive and unobtrusive design due to being visible within the roof slopes or where roofs are prominent in long distance views.”

2.6 The existing dormer window to the side elevation would measure approximately 1.0m height x 2.4m width The proposed dormers would measure approximately 1.8m with and 2.5m in height to the side elevation the dormer would be position centrally within the existing roof slope and would meet planning guidance as the dormer is 2.4m from the side 0.5 from the eaves and 1.5 ridge of the roof. The proposed dormer would be increase by 1m in height and 0.01m in width.

2.7 The rear dormer would be approximately 0.8m in width and 2.6m in height, the dormer would be approximately 0.5m to the north, 1.5m to the south and the dormer extension would be from the side and 1.5m from the roof ridge the dormer is in compliance with planning policy in terms of its location within the roof slope. However, the dormer extension to the side and the proposed new rear dormer are not considered to be subordinate and generally upset the balance and coherence of the surrounding roofscape, thus harming the appearance of the host building and the composition of which it forms part.

2.8 Within this context, the proposed rear dormer, justifies a reason for refusal. It is considered that such roof level alterations would impact the character and appearance of the host building, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal is therefore considered unacceptable in design terms, contrary to DP24 and DP25 of the LDF, CPG1 and the conservation area appraisal.

2.9 By virtue of their scale, proportions and siting of the proposed dormer extensions it's considered that the proposed extension would create an unacceptably obtrusive and incongruous form of development, and would harm the appearance of the existing roofline. Moreover, in terms of respecting local character, policy justification states that past alterations and extensions should not be regarded as a precedent. On this basis it is considered to harm the historic character and appearance of the group of which it forms part and the wider conservation area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the design guidance of CPG 1 (Design) and policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

2.10 It is considered that the proposed roof light would be permissible under class C of the GPDO 2008 as the alteration would not protrude more than 150mm from the plane of the roof slope, if consideration is made to the original roof, when measured in perpendicular with the external surface of the original roof.

3.0 Impact on the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers

3.1 There is no direct overlooking through the windows neither into a habitable room as the side dormer exists or to the rear. Therefore, no amenity concerns are raised by the proposal. The proposed dormers and rooflight considered to be in compliance with policy DP26 and CPG guidelines and are acceptable on amenity terms.

4.0 Recommendation

4.1 Refuse planning consent