<b>Delegated Rep</b>	Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	09/06/2014			
	N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	11/06/2014			
Officer		Application	n Number(s)				
Obote Hope		2014/1366/	Р				
Application Address	Drawing N	Drawing Numbers					
Flat Second and Third Floor 26 Steeles Road London NW3 4RH		Please refe	Please refer to decision notice				
PO 3/4 Area Team	Signature C&UD	Authorised	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Demolition of existing dorn the replacement of existing elevation.							
Recommendation(s): Refuse Planning Consent							
Application Type:	Full Planning Permiss	sion					

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice									
Informatives:										
Consultations										
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	15	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02				
			No. Electronic	02						
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice displayed from 24/04/2014 until 15/05/2014 Press notice displayed from 23/04/2014 until 14/05/2014									
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<ul> <li>"We feel very strongly that approval of these applications could set an unhappy and dangerous precedent for further roof extensions. The thought of roof terraces with deck chairs and parasols along these old conservation area roofscapes is appalling and completely unacceptable, and these applications should be refused".</li> <li>Officers comment</li> <li>The application for the proposed roof terrace has been determined under application 2014/2894/P that was refused planning consent</li> </ul>									

# **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.

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.

## **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 15<sup>th</sup> October 1982.

## 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)

CPG6 (Amenity)

## **Eton Conservation Area Statement 2002**

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

### **Assessment**

#### 1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of 2 x dormer windows, following the replacement of the existing rooflight and dormer window to the front roofslope.
- 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 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 states that development should be of the highest standard of design and should consider the character, setting, context and form and scale of neighbouring buildings; and the character and proportions of the existing building. The existing roofscape of Steeles Road is characterised by a variety of front and rear dormers set within the roofslope and mainly subordinate in size and location to the roof.
- 2.2 The proposed dormer window to the west elevation would measure approximately 1.2m width x 1.2m in height and a depth of 1.5m the dormer replaces the rooflight that is not compliant with planning policy guidance of being 0.5m from the ridge and eaves of the roof. The proposed east dormer would replace the existing 1.6m (height) x 1.3m (width) dormer with a 2.7m (width) x 1.5m (height) and 1.5m (depth) dormer window. The proposed dormers would have excessively large lintel that measures approximately 0.3m, the windows would be timer framed and painted white to match the aesthetics of the host building and the row of terraces which it forms a part of.
- 2.3 The proposed dormers does not fully comply wth the Council's guidance in terms of being subservient and set well within the main roof, below the ridge, eaves levels and set in from the sides. Furthermore, the dormer to the west fall short of being within 0.5m of the side of the roof as it is set within 0.3m. Notwithstanding this, the front dormer would be a bulky addition to the principal elevation and would fail to preserve or enhace the host building that is considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area. I am of the opinion that the proposed dormer extension would result in unreasonable levels of harm to the character of the host building, surrounding street scene and conservation area.
- 2.4 When taken in context with other dormer extension, the proposals are not considered to be appropriately designed in terms of scale and form nor does the dormer window appear sensitive to the appearance of the building. The windows on the dormers does not relate well in appearance and proportion to the timber windows below. Camden planning guidance advises that alterations to, or the addition of, new dormers should be sensitive to changes which maintain the overall structure of the existing roof form. Given the number of alterations carried out in the roofscape and the existing designed dormer that are visible from street level, the enlargement of the existing front dormer and installation of a new front dormer are not considered as unacceptable additions to the principal elevation. And as such, the alterations to the principal elevation would not be compliant with the main aims and objectives of policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

#### 3.0 Impact on the amenity of surrounding residential occupiers

3.1 It's considered that the erection of an additional dormer window would not be more intensive than existing views from windows on the lower levels and from the existing terrace, and as such are considered to be acceptable in this instance. There is no direct overlooking of windows of habitable rooms. Therefore the proposal is considered to not have any other harmful impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and generally complies with the aims and objectives of Policy DP26 of the LDF.

#### 4.0 Recommendation

4.1 It is recommended that the application is refused.