Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry	Date:	12/11/20	)14		
		N/A / attached		<b>Expiry</b>		1 3/111/111/1			
Officer Mandeep Chagger			Application Nu 2014/5213/P	Application Number(s) 2014/5213/P					
Application Address			Drawing Numb	Drawing Numbers					
Flat 2nd and 3rd Floor, 41 Montpelier Grove London London NW5 2XE				Please see draft decision notice.					
PO 3/4 Area Tea	m Signature	e C&UD	Authorised Off	icer Si	gnature				
Proposal(s)									
Installation of new dormers to front and rear and raising height of existing flue to rear of property.									
Recommendation(s):	Grant								
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission								
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice								
Informatives:									
Consultations									
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	18	No. of responses	00	No. of c	bjections	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	The proposal was advertised in the Ham & High on the 25/09/2014 and site notices was erected on the 24/09/2014. No comments were received.								
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	Kentish To	own CAAC -	– No comments recei	ved.					

# **Site Description**

The site is located on the west side of Montpelier Grove and comprises a mid-terrace 4 storey building which is divided into flats. The site is not listed, but is within the Kentish Town Conservation Area. The surrounding area comprises terraced properties, with front and rear dormer windows a prominent feature of Montpelier Grove.

### **Relevant History**

The application follows pre application advice (ref. 2014/3611/PRE) for the extension to top floor to create bedroom/dormers in roof space.

### Relevant policies

# LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

#### LDF Development Policies 2010:

DP24 - Securing high quality design

DP25 - Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

# **Camden Planning Guidance 2011:**

CPG1: Design

**Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement** 

#### **Assessment**

#### 1 Proposal

- 1.1 The application seeks planning permission for an enlargement of the front and rear dormer window and raising the height of existing flue to rear of property.
- 1.2The front dormer window would be wider than the existing dormer window with a flat roof and set in 500mm from the roof margins.
- 1.3 The rear dormer window would be set in 500mm from the roof margins, roof ridge and eaves. The dormer window would have a flat roof and folding sliding doors. New railings 1.1m high would front the sliding doors.
- 1.4 The existing stainless steel flue extends slightly higher than the ridge of the main roof.
- 1.5 The key issues to consider are:-
  - -Design and impact on conservation area.
  - -Amenity

### 2 Design and impact on Conservation Area.

- 2.1 The building is part of a terrace of eight buildings, three of which have existing dormers of varying sizes to the rear. To the front, five of the original dormers have been replaced with enlarged dormers. The application site is one of the three properties which has an existing dormer and terrace to the rear, the proposal would see this enlarged.
- 2.2 Camden Planning Guidance states that roof additions or alterations are likely to be unacceptable where there are complete terraces or groups of buildings which have a roofline which is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions.
- 2.3 Paragraph 5.11 of CPG1 sets out detailed advice on the design of roof dormers. It states that dormers should be 'sufficiently below the ridge of the roof in order to avoid projecting into the roofline when viewed from a distance. Usually 500mm gap is required between the dormer and the ridge or hip to maintain this separation'. It goes on to state that 'the dormer and window should relate to the façade below, with windows generally being subordinate'.
- 2.4 Although front dormer roof extensions are normally not acceptable, as a result of their impact on the streetscene, paragraph 5.7 of CPG1 states that where 'There are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm' roof alterations may be considered acceptable. It is acknowledged that in the subject terrace, only three of the eight properties retained their 'original form' front dormer roof projections; however, given the prevailing character and appearance of the street as a whole, it is not considered that the loss of the existing narrow dormer for a wider roof projection would significantly affect the streetscene, or the special character and appearance of the Kentish Town conservation area.
- 2.5 The front and rear dormers have thick edges making them somewhat heavy-looking and bulky compared to normal fully glazed ones. In particular the wider rear dormer is somewhat large and bulky looking with these bevelled edges. However it would be difficult to sustain a refusal for this, given that it matches a rear dormer of similar size and design 2 doors away at no.43. In the context of a wide variety of large and differently designed dormers in the area, this is considered acceptable.
- 2.6 The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its scale and bulk, complying with detailed

advice set out in CPG1, Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Development Plan.

# 3 Neighbour amenity

- 3.1 The Council has a duty to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause material harm to amenity in accordance with Policy DP26.
- 3.2 As there is an existing dormer and terrace at the property it is considered the proposal would not impact neighbouring amenity. On this basis, the proposals would comply with Policy DP26 of the Development Plan, and advice set out in CPG6.
- 3.3 The existing bathroom flue would extend slightly higher. As there is an existing flue and this would be further away from habitable room windows, it is considered the extended flue would not have an unacceptable noise and smells impact on adjoining or nearby properties.

Recommendation:	Grant planning permission.