

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		19/11/2014	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		20/10/2014	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Hugh Miller				2014/5678/P 2014/5828/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
12 Rosslyn Hill London NW3 1PH				See draft decision			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
A: 2014/5678/P - Erection of roof extension to rear closet wing at 2nd floor level and new balustrade to retained terrace							
B: 2014/5828/L - Erection of roof extension to rear closet wing at 2nd floor level and new balustrade to retained terrace and associated internal works							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b> <b>Refuse Listed Building Consent</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Householder Application</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>13</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
				No. electronic	<b>01</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<i>Applications advertised in local press – 02/10/2014, expire 23/10/2014.</i> <i>Site Notice displayed 01/10/2014, expires 22/10/2014.</i> <u>The Coach House, 2 and a Half Hampstead Hill Gardens - Objection</u> <i>We oppose the application as it may block our light and further develop an already overbuilt area.</i>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		<b><u>Hampstead CAAC</u></b> No response at time of written report.					

## Site Description

A basement + 3-storey detached building located on the north side of Rosslyn Hill at the junction with Hampstead Hill Gardens; to its rear lies no. 12A Rosslyn Hill a 2-storey dwelling. The host building is converted into 7x self-contained flats. The building is Listed Grade II similar to nos. 1 & 2. The building is within the designated Hampstead Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

January 1973 – PP Granted - conversion of No. 12, Rosslyn Hill, into seven self- contained flats; ref. 14587

September 2013 - LBC Granted - Installation of an internal ventilation duct at ceiling level and black painted cast iron grille (228 x 152mm) to the rear elevation, all at second floor level; ref. 2013/4143/L

October 1997 – PP Granted - Erection of conservatory at rear and replacement of existing fence on side boundary with brick wall and entrance canopy; ref. PW9702543R1

### 12A, Rosslyn Hill – R/O 12 Rosslyn Hill

August 1965 – PP Granted - The erection of extensions at ground and first floor levels at "The Coach House", 12A, Rosslyn Hill; ref. F7/5/A/668

## Relevant policies

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

#### LDF Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage / conservation areas)

#### Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011/2013.**

Design - CPG1 - Sections 1; 2; 3; 4 & 5

Amenity - CPG6 - Section 6 Daylight and sunlight

Section 7 Overlooking, privacy and outlook

### **Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy**

(Quality Erosion) – page 57; Roof extensions – page 62- 63.

### **London Plan (2011)**

### **NPPF 2012**

## Assessment

### Proposal

- A: 2014/5678/P - Erection of extension to rear closet wing at 2nd floor level, retention of part roof terrace with new balustrade
- B: 2014/5828/L - Erection of extension to rear closet wing at 2nd floor level, retention of part roof terrace with new balustrade and associated internal works

The main concerns are: **a]** design and impact on the buildings listed and historic fabric, & impact on the conservation area and **b]** amenity.

### 2.0 Design / Listed buildings

2.1 The host building has a single common entrance and staircase providing access to the upper ground, first and second floor flats. This application is associated with Flat 4, which is located on the second floor of the building with its roof terrace to the rear (North-west side). Flat 4 comprises 1x bedroom, (2x persons) self-contained flat and an external terrace of 28 m<sup>2</sup>. The proposal is to build over the existing roof terrace at roof level on top of a two-storey rear wing which abuts Hampstead Hill Gardens. The proposed development would allow retention of an 'L' shaped roof terrace roof as part of the scheme.

2.2 The Council's LDP Policy DP24 (*Securing high quality design*) states "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. Paragraph 24.7 states "Development should consider:

- the character and constraints of its site;
- the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;
- the compatibility of materials, their quality, texture, tone and colour;
- the composition of elevations;
- the suitability of the proposed design to its intended use;
- its contribution to public realm, and its impact on views and vistas; and
- the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value.

2.3 Policy DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) state "To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will: **f)** only grant consent for ..... alterations and extensions to listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building";

2.4 Paragraph 132 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) state, "When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of a grade II listed building, park or garden should be exceptional. Substantial harm to or loss of designated heritage assets of the highest significance, notably scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, grade I and II\* listed buildings, grade I and II\* registered parks and gardens, and World Heritage Sites, should be wholly exceptional."

2.5 Paragraph 133 of the NPPF states, "Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance of a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss,...". It is considered that the proposed

extension would lead to demonstrable harm to the existing listed building which would not be outweighed by any public benefits.

2.6 The Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (HCAAMS), (Quality Erosion) state, “There continues to be a steady erosion of many of the attributes of the character and appearance of the area, especially, but not necessarily confined to, residential dwellings. These mainly concern:

- alteration and addition to roofs
- alteration to or replacement of windows, porches, doors, and other features
- new additions which show little respect to their historic context
- loss of original features
- inappropriate extensions .”

2.7 H31 of the HCAAMS state “...Roof extensions are unlikely to be acceptable where:

- It would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building
- The roof is prominent, particularly in long views
- The building is higher than many of its surrounding neighbours. Any further roof extensions are therefore likely to be unacceptably prominent.”

The existing roof terrace area of the host building is not considered visually prominent from Hampstead Hill Gardens, however, the additional building bulk in this setting is considered visually prominent in both long and short views which would cause harm to the appearance of the host building and the conservation area and is therefore unacceptable.

2.8 CPG1 (Design) Rear extensions para. 4.13 state “In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged”. The proposed extension would be contrary to this as it would be located above eaves height. The existing building’s composition displays a range of heights, with a hierarchy between the two prominent, tall elements, emphasised by very ornate chimneys, and the subordinate lower part to the rear. The proposal would interfere with that relationship, creating a more uniform height across the entire side elevation of the house and concealing the central chimney and upper parts of the house from view. It would also entail the loss of the original terrace and finely detailed rubbed brick door and window heads leading to the terrace.

2.9 The proposal is therefore unacceptable in listed building terms for loss of fabric and loss of original plan. It would also detract from the character of the conservation area and add unacceptable bulk at high level in an exposed position. Finally, it is contrary to CPG1, which states that rear extensions should not be higher than a storey below eaves height and should respect and preserve the existing design and proportions of the building and its original architectural features, while stating that roof alterations would be inappropriate where the building is designed as a complete composition.

2.10 Previously approved roof extensions should not be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals and therefore the proposed roof extension is considered unacceptable. On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to harm the historic interest of the host building and would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the Hampstead conservation area. The proposed roof alteration would not to be in compliance with policies CS14, DP24 or DP25 and does not comply with guidance set out in Camden Planning Guidance 1 or the Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal.

#### Internal alterations:

2.11 A consequence of the extension is that it would create 1x additional bedroom as replacement for the existing living/dining room. Whilst the stud partition wall and storage cupboards would not cause significant harm to the buildings historic fabric, the existing window fronting the roof terrace would be bricked-in and cause loss of historic fabric and impact negatively on the appearance of the host building.

2.12 The existing rear wall and the delicate detailed rubbed brick door and window heads which would become an inner wall inside the new bedroom; and it is considered that even if these features were

retained, their inner location would alter their character, and where they would be at risk of being decorated over resulting in permanent loss and all to the detriment of the fabric of the historic building.

2.13 On the basis of the above, the proposal is considered to harm the historic interest of the host building and would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the Hampstead conservation area. The proposed internal alterations are considered not to be in compliance with LDF policy DP25.

### **3.0 Amenity**

3.1 The windows of the proposed roof extension being smaller than the roof terrace would provide limited views of the neighbouring buildings and some rear gardens; and owing to the location at 2<sup>nd</sup> floor level is considered would not to cause any additional significant harm to occupiers amenities in terms of loss of privacy or outlook and is considered satisfactory.

3.2 The retained 'L' shaped roof terrace is not considered to cause any additional harm in terms of noise disturbance to neighbouring occupiers and the proposed terrace is considered satisfactory.

3.3 In terms of setting and height the proposed extension is considered not to impact negatively on adjoining occupiers' day/sunlight and is satisfactory.

3.4 In terms of amenity, the proposed roof terrace would be in compliance with policy DP26.

**4.0 Recommendation:** Refuse Planning permission & Listed building consent

### **Photographs**





North – west elevation – view from Hampstead Hill Gardens



Window to be bricked-up.



View of rear elevation





Detailed rubbed brick door and window heads





View of existing roof terrace



View of existing roof terrace + hipped roof