

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		23/01/2015	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		01/01/2015	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Olivier Nelson				2014/7401/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
22 Ferncroft Avenue London NW3 7PE				See attached			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of rear dormer roof extension to existing dwelling house (class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	14	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notice: 05/12/2014 – 26/12/2014 Press notice : 11/12/2014 – 01/01/2015 No responses were received					
Redington/Frognaal CAAC		No comments were received					
Site Description							
The application site relates to a detached five-storey property located on the north side of Ferncroft Avenue. The site is located within the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area, it is not listed but is noted as being a positive contributor to the Conservation Area.							
Relevant History							
2014/0241/P - Extension of existing basement (with front and rear lightwells) to match proposed extended footprint of the ground floor above. Rear extension at ground floor level, two rooflights and garage to side elevation. Granted 03/09/2014							

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London 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

DP25: Conserving Camden's Heritage

DP26: Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2011 : CPG1 – Design

Redington and Frogna Conservation Area Statement 2000

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a hipped roof dormer on the rear elevation of the property.

1.2 The proposed dormer would have a width of 2.1 metres across the rear elevation and a depth of 2.3 metres on the side elevation. It would be set down from the ridge of the property by 0.3 metres and set up from the eaves by 0.4 metres. The dormer would be finished in matching materials to the existing roof. There would be one sash window on the rear elevation which would be similar to the fenestration on the rear elevation. The window frame would be of hardwood construction and painted white and would have slimline glazing similar to the recently approved changes to the windows (2014/0241/P).

2. Design

2.1 Policy DP24 requires development to be sensitive to the character and proportions of the host building. CPG1 states that alterations to, or the addition of, roof dormers should be sensitive changes which maintain the overall structure of the existing roof form. Proposals that achieve this will be generally considered acceptable providing the criteria set out in the supporting paragraph 5.11 are met.

2.2 The guidance specifically states that dormer should not be introduced where they cut through the sloped edge of a hipped roof and that they should be set away from the ridge, hip and eaves by a minimum of 0.5 metres. The proposed dormer fails to comply with this guidance. The proposed dormer is not in keeping with the scale and positioning of the building. The dormer would not follow the existing fenestration pattern. The addition of a dormer would clutter the appearance of the rear roof slope. It is considered that the roof would be overwhelmed by additional dormers. Its appearance behind the chimney stack is not considered to be of good design. Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. In this case the proposal is considered to be of a poor design that detracts from the quality of the area.

2.3 The proposed materials would complement the main building and the use of traditional materials is welcomed. The proposed sash window would have hardwood frames and have glazing; this is considered to be acceptable and would be in keeping with the recently approved changes to the windows.

2.4 The proposal would not be easily visible from the public realm. However, it is considered that the proposal would cause harm to the character and appearance of this part of the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area through the over proliferation of rear dormer extensions. The proposal is not in accordance with policies DP24 & DP25 of the LDF Development Policies Development Plan.

3. Amenity

3.1 The proposed does not raise concerns in respect of neighbouring residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook and privacy to the neighbouring properties on the adjoining sites, particularly as the boundary treatment around the rear garden is high. This secludes the rear of the house from its neighbours.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission