

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	15/08/2014
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	17/7/2014
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Nanayaa Ampoma			2014/3922/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
Flat 3 140 Goldhurst Terrace Hampstead London NW6 3HP			1188.01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 06, 07, 08, 09A, 10A, 11, 12, 13,14A and Design and Access.	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Erection of a rear roof extension at second floor level to create large dormer window with balcony to existing top floor flat (class C3).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>30</b>	No. of responses	<b>07</b>	No. of objections	<b>05</b>
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>No. electronic <b>00</b></p> <p>A Site Notice was displayed at the property for a period of 21 days between 25/06/2014 to 16/07/2014.</p> <p>Adjoining neighbours were also notified. Comments were received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ground floor flat, 138 Goldhurst Terrace</li> <li>▪ Flat 2, 138 Goldhurst Terrace</li> <li>▪ 140 Goldhurst Terrace</li> <li>▪ 48 Canfield Gardens</li> </ul> <p>These comments can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased loss of privacy to Flat 2 138 Goldhurst Terrace</li> <li>▪ Objection to increase in ridge height as it would alter appearance of the row of terraced houses</li> <li>▪ Proposal would set a negative precedent</li> <li>▪ Scale is too excessive</li> <li>▪ Would lead to increased light pollution</li> <li>▪ Would lead to greater noise pollution</li> <li>▪ Development would make the roof unbalanced</li> <li>▪ Proposal does not respect the character of building</li> <li>▪ Development would cause increased shade to 138 Goldhurst Terrace</li> <li>▪ Applicant has ignored design guidelines for the area</li> <li>▪ Proposal would break the symmetry of the building</li> <li>▪ Works raise building control issues</li> <li>▪ Similar application was refused by Camden Council for the above reasons recently at 142 flat 3 Goldhurst Terrace ref: 2011/0885/P</li> </ul> <p><i>Officers response: Application 2011/0885/P was for Installation of a dormer window to upper rear roof slope of flat (C3). As with the current application that property also has a mansard roof. This application was withdrawn after officers expressed concerns.</i></p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p><b>Combined Residents' Association of South Hampstead CRASH:</b> Object strongly to the application. Object to any increase in ridge height as this would radically alter the character of the property; application disregards Camden Core Strategy; application would set a precedent; proposal shows no understanding of, or sympathy for, the architectural heritage of the building or area.</p>					

## Site Description

The application site relates to a three storey residential dwelling which appears to have been part of a large housing development on the road. It is not clear when the properties were built, however they are believed to date back to the Victorian period. The property is finished in exposed redbrick and white painted window and door frames as well as a mansard roof finished in slate.

In its original form, the property was developed as a large single family dwelling. However was converted into three flats in the 1950's under application TP/64489/30706. The property has been the subject of several extensions and alterations especially to its rear. Presently, it benefits from a single storey rear extension/conservatory at ground floor and a terrace at roof level.

The site falls within the South Hampstead Conservation Area. This was previously known as the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area until February 2011 when the name was changed to reflect the change in the spatial and historic relationship with Hampstead. The property is also the subject of an Article 4 Directive placed on it in September 2010. The Directive restricts alterations to the property's front, side and in some cases, rear elevation.

## Relevant History

**9300450:** The retention and enclosure of the first floor rear roof terrace as shown on drawing ref 1 2 3 - Grant

**8803640:** Formation of a roof terrace at the rear first floor level as shown on drawing no. 188/02 - Refusal

**25391:** The retention of a means of access to the highway in connection with use of part of the front garden area for car parking purposes.- Grant

**23378:** The construction of a means of access to the highway in connection with the use of part of the front garden area for car parking purposes.

**TP/64489/30706:** The conversion into three self-contained flats.- Grant (1952)

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### Core Strategy (2010)

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS19 Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

#### Development Policies (2010)

DP24 Securing High Quality Design

DP25 Conserving Camden's Heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

#### Supplementary Planning Policies

Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design Section 5.8

Camden Planning Guidance 6 Amenity Section 5.2 and 7.4

## South Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

### Assessment

#### Proposal

- 1.1 The application proposes to build a full width rear dormer over the existing mansard roof with a new third floor balcony. The proposed development would have three windows looking towards the rear garden. The addition would project from the current ridgeline by 2.4 metres. Although it should also be noted that the ridge height would be raised by 24cm. The development would also lead to the raising of the existing chimney and parapet wall.

#### Amendments

- 2.1 Under the original application the proposal involved a much higher dormer window (see superseded plans 1188.10, 1188.09 and 1188.14). These plans were rejected as officers expressed concern regarding the scale and design of the proposed dormer. As a result of these concerns, amended plans were submitted proposing a dormer of a lower height. However the dormer would still span the full width of the rear roof slope and would sit on top of an existing mansard roof and therefore officers concerns still remain as much of the works remained the same.
- 2.2 It should be noted that no additional consultation was made in regard to the amended plans as these reduced the impact of the development and would therefore have created less perceived harm.

#### Current Development

##### *Design*

- 3.1 Policies CS14 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies states that the Council will require all developments including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest design standard in terms of the character, sitting, context, form and scale to the existing building and the general area.
- 3.2 Policies CS5 (Core Strategy) and DP25 (Development Policies) states that the Council will only give permission to developments in Conservation Areas if they preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- 3.3 Whilst the supplementary design guidance CPG 1, states that roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable if they are likely to have an adverse impact on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. This includes:
  - Those developments in an unbroken roof line that are largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions
  - Buildings or terraces which already have an additional storey or mansard;
  - Buildings designed as a complete architectural composition and the proposed development would undermine the style or roof level. Goldhurst Terrace, especially to the west of the road (towards Prior Road) has a very distinctive mansard roof design that is repeated in the row of buildings.
  - Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by an additional roof extension.

- 3.4 The above guidance is applicable in the case of 140 Goldhurst Terrace as the building is part of a complete composition; there is largely an unbroken roofline (on the west of the site); and the property already has a mansard roof.
- 3.5 The proposed dormer would span the full width of the rear elevation. It would also raise the ridge height. As the property benefits from a mansard roof presently, the proposed dormer would sit at the highest part of this mansard. At this elevation it would give the appearance of a double roof development. This is clearly at odds with policy and general guidance on design. Due to the height, bulk and mass of the proposal, on top of an existing roof extension, it is considered that the proposal would create a dominant and incongruous addition at roof level. The development also fails to comply with Camden planning guidance on design because it would have a harmful effect on the roofline, create an additional dormer on a mansard roof, disrupt the architectural composition and create a large and dominate development that would detract from the appearance of the existing property.
- 3.6 The development also fails to comply with the West Hampstead Conservation Appraisal because the design of the proposed dormer does not demonstrate *careful* and *sensitive* design taking into account the original building. The result would be an increased visual bulk to the roof, a development that draws attention from existing roof slope and a roof development that is not subordinate to the host building. Therefore the rear dormer does not preserve or enhance the character of the host building or the Conservation Area and is unacceptable.

#### *Amenity*

- 3.7 Comments have been received from no.138 on the grounds that the development may have an impact on the level of light to their property and would cause greater overlooking and loss of privacy.
- 3.8 Under planning guidance CPG 6 which focuses on amenity, all developments are required to have some regard for the amenity of existing and future occupants. Policies CS5 (Core Strategy) and DP26 (Development Policies) state that the council will protect the quality of life of existing and future occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for those developments that would not have a harmful effect on amenity. Such issues include visual privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.
- 3.9 Although the new development would create a new balcony, there is currently a relatively large balcony at roof level already. There are three windows proposed in the rear elevation of the dormer that would look towards the rear garden. As there are already several windows at this elevation looking towards the rear garden it would be difficult to argue that the proposed additional dormer would lead to *increased* overlooking although it would create another opening to overlook the garden, this opening would simply add to what is currently available. The proposed dormer would set recessed from the edge of the existing roof and would have no additional windows to the side. In this respect, it is unlikely to lead to overlooking to either neighbouring property or cause significant loss of privacy.
- 3.10 Additionally, it cannot be argued that the development would create greater light pollution. DP26 is clear to note that artificial lighting can have a harmful effect on an area if it is not used correctly in terms of its position and intensity. However as stated above the existing roof is already in use. Presumably there is light from this unit currently. The additional roof is likely to produce a similar level of light and is unlikely to be significant. The same is felt regarding increased noise. The balcony is accessible and can be used presently. Therefore there are no significant issues regarding amenity.

*Neighbour objections*

3.11 Much of the comments and objections from neighbours have been discussed above, however the below details are not planning matters:

- Building control issues

**Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission**