Delegated Rep	ort Analy	Analysis sheet		30/04/2014			
	N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	02/04/2014			
Officer			tion Number(s)				
Seonaid Carr		2014/14	70/P				
Application Address		Drawing	g Numbers				
Flat 18 Burgess Park Mansions Fortune Green Road London NW6 1DP		See dra	See draft decision				
PO 3/4 Area Tear	n Signature C&	UD Authori	sed Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Demolition of part of rear installation of 4 front and	•			r dormer,			
Recommendation(s):	Refuse permission						
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission						

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice								
Informatives:									
Consultations									
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	25	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00			
Summary of consultation responses:	The site is not within a conservation area as such no press or site notice are required.  One letter of support was received which is summarised below:  • We endorse this application as it would contribute to raise the profile regarding quality of life for this property and it will help maintain the historic value for residential living.  • It is entirely in keeping with parallel building development in the area, in particular the redevelopment of the Kings College Campus across Finchley Road.  • It is a very welcome step into the right direction of maintaining the original character of these period residential buildings and prevents another split up into smaller more profitable units by business orientated developers that have a widely recognised negative impact on historic London living quarters.  Officer comment:								
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<ul> <li>The proposed development is not considered to appropriate in design terms as discussed within the design section of the assessment.</li> <li>The development would not prevent a developer submitting an application to split the unit into smaller units, this point is not a material planning consideration in the determination of this application.</li> </ul> N/A								

## **Site Description**

The application site is a four storey early 20th century mansion block with roof extension that is occupied by self-contained residential units on the east by Finchley Road. The building forms part of a number of similar residential blocks including nos. 1 to 6, nos. 7 to 10 and nos 11 to 18. The application relates to Flat 18 which is located at third floor level of the south end residential block.

The site is not within a conservation area and the building is not listed but the application property is located next to a Grade II listed building (128 Fortune Green Road).

### **Relevant History**

## **Application site**

2013/1663/P – Planning permission refused for alterations to roof profile including remodelling rear part and installation of 4x roof lights to front roof slope, in association with provision of rear roof terrace and additional accommodation at fourth floor level of residential flat (Class C3). Application refused for

### **Burgess Park Mansions**

8400803 – Planning permission was granted at appeal on 11/03/1985 for the conversion of roofspace to form 5 self-contained flats including extensions and alterations to the roof.

#### Flats 1- 6 Burgess Park Mansions

8703022 - Planning permission was granted on 08/06/1988 for conversion of roof space to form two self- contained flats together with the installation of dormer windows.

## Flat 5, 5 Burgess Park Mansions

9300842 - Planning permission was refused on 18/11/1993 for alterations to the enlargement of the existing windows on both the Fortune Green Road and Finchley Road elevations of flat 5 (roof level). The proposal was considered unacceptable as the alterations would have an adverse impact on the appearance of the building and visual amenity of the surrounding area. Due to their increased prominence they would give to the roof extension.

9500993 - Planning permission was granted on 02/11/1995 for the rebuilding of the roof extension in accordance with the details submitted.

PWX0103825 - Planning permission was granted on 20/11/2001 for alterations to fourth storey windows on the Fortune Green Road elevation to match those existing on first, second and third floors.

## Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)

The Landon Plan (2011)

#### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

## **Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

CPG1 (Design) – Section 5 CPG6 (Amenity) – Sections 6 and 7

## **Assessment**

## **Proposal**

Planning permission is sought to remove the hipped roof of the four storey rear return to flatten and create a terrace at 4<sup>th</sup> floor level together with the erection of a dual pitched dormer to the rear roof slope. The proposed dormer would measure 4.2m wide, 2.9m deep with a dual pitched lead roof that at its highest would project 2.3m above the finished floor level of the terrace area. The façade of the dormer would incorporate a series of five sliding doors. The terrace area would measure 44.6sqm and would be bound by planters and a 1m high balustrade.

The development would also include the installation of five rooflights.

## Design

Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and consider the character and proportions of the existing building and the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties.

CPG1 sets criteria to establish the acceptability of roof additions in principle (see pages 35-36). According the this criteria additional storey or roof alterations are likely to be acceptable if there is an established roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape. It is also noted within these pages that a roof addition will not be acceptable where it the building has been designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level. CPG1 also states that alteration to, or the addition of, roof dormers should be sensitive changes which maintain the overall structure of the existing roof form and a terrace provided at roof level should be set back behind the slope of a pitched roof or behind a parapet on a flat roof.

With specific regard to terraces, CPG1 notes that terraces should form an integral element in the design of elevations, its acceptability is dependent on how it complements the elevations upon which is it located.

As the building existing 1-18 Burgess Park Mansions has a traditional pitched roof profile which suits the traditional appearance of this building. The building is comprised of two parts, the main body and the rear return which occupies approximately a third of the width of the building, therefore contributing to the integrity and character of the building. Furthermore the existing roof profile of the building contributes to the uniform design of this mansion blocks. Although it is noted that the adjoining corner building (571-575 Finchley Road) to the north is higher than Burgess Park Mansions and has a different roof profile this does not interfere with the architectural composition of Burgess Park Mansions which is distinctly different to the neighbouring properties.

The proposal would result in loss of the rear gable feature which is considered to be key to the integrity of the building, as such its loss would be wholly out of context with the traditional appearance and detailing of the existing building. As such the loss of this feature of the property would not consider the character of the existing building thereby directly contravening DP24.

The proposed terrace would occupy the entire area of the rear return measuring 44.6 sqm which is a considerable size for a terrace. The principle of having a terrace at this level is not considered acceptable. The terrace would have a significantly detrimental impact on the existing elevation by virtue of the removal of the hipped roof and additional visual clutter at this elevated position.

The proposed dormer, is considered to be bulky in its appearance, at 4.2m wide the dormer would not relate to the windows in the elevation below as noted within paragraph 5.11 point d of CPG1. As such the development would fail to take account of the proportions of the existing building, contrary to DP24.

The proposed roof addition and roof terrace would partially be visible from Fortune Green Road on oblique angles and would be more obvious on Weech Road (between two houses). Given the high level position of the proposed roof addition and alterations the proposal would have a considerable impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The proposed roof addition and alterations would not be subservient to the existing roof profile as they would substantially alter and dominate the existing roof profile. The proposed roof addition and alterations are considered to be unacceptable in design terms.

The proposed roof lights are considered not to significantly affect the appearance of the existing roof profile and on their own are considered to be acceptable in design terms.

# Impact on neighbour amenity

Policy DP26 aims to protect the quality of life of neighbours that might be affected by developments. It is unlikely that the proposal would affect the daylight/sunlight amenities of the neighbouring properties. There would be some overlooking from the proposed roof terrace to the rear windows of the second floor flat below the application property and the adjoining third floor flat in very oblique angles. It is unlikely that there would be an unacceptable level of overlooking from these very oblique angled positions on the proposed roof terrace to the habitable rooms of the neighbouring flats.

Given the existing relationship among the windows of the application property and neighbouring properties the openings of the proposed roof addition would not result in increased overlooking to the habitable rooms of the neighbouring properties.

The proposal is considered not to significantly affect the amenities of the neighbouring residential properties.

#### Conclusion

The proposed roof addition and alterations by reason of their size, bulk and design would dominate the roof profile and would harm the character and appearance of the existing building and the surrounding area.

**Recommendation:** Refuse permission