

**PLANNING, DESIGN & ACCESS & HERITAGE**

**IMPACT STATEMENT**

for

**1 GLENILLA ROAD, LONDON, NW3 4AJ**

**Prepared for Mr Bengis**

**Hedley Clark**

Karen@hedleyclark.co.uk  
www.hedleyclark.co.uk  
Tel: 01420 489851 or 07766 650569

## **CONTENTS PAGE**

- 1.0 Introduction
- Background
  - Description of Site/Character of Area
- 2.0 Planning History
- 3.0 The Proposal
- 4.0 Design and Access Component
- 5.0 Planning Policy Framework
- 6.0 Planning Policy Compliance
- NPPF
  - Development Plan
  - Heritage Impact Assessment
  - Impact on Neighbouring Amenity
- 7.0 Other Material Considerations
- 8.0 Conclusion

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This Statement has been prepared and submitted in support of a planning application for a dormer window extension, in association with the conversion of the roof space to habitable accommodation at 1 Glenilla Road, NW3 4AJ (“the Site”).
- 1.2 This statement should be read in conjunction with the Drawings prepared by XUL Architecture.

### **Background**

- 1.3 Planning permission was granted under 13/5538/P for a single storey rear extension, installation of new windows throughout and 6 skylights at roof level together with the enlargement of an existing basement including the addition of front and rear lightwells. This permission was subject to a number of conditions and a legal agreement to secure the submission of a Construction Management Plan.
- 1.4 Works pursuant to the approved details commenced during 2014 and included the formation of a dormer window extension (which is only partially completed) for which a separate application was submitted under 14/6097/P. Consent was refused for the dormer window extension, as set out in Section 2.
- 1.5 Works have ceased on site and the basic timber framing for the refused dormer window extension remains on site. This amended application seeks permission for a substantially reduced dormer roof extension and if approved the existing timber framing/opening on the roof would be modified accordingly.

**Description of Site/Character of Area**

- 1.6 The application site comprises an end of terrace property which forms part of a short terrace of similar houses on the northern side of Glenilla Road. The Edwardian property is set back from the road with a low brick wall defining the front boundary. The property extends over four floors, including the original small basement area and an area within the roof space. A single storey projection to the rear provided the former kitchen area. This was a flat and glass roofed structure sited along the common boundary with no.3 to the east.
- 1.7 The front façade includes a slate mansard roof detail with a double set of dormer windows and rooflight. The front elevation is painted brickwork. The rear façade benefits from a dormer extension on the rear mansard and a roof light above.
- 1.8 The property benefits from a private rear garden. There are no trees of merit within the boundary of the site.
- 1.9 The site lies within the Belsize Park Conservation Area (sub-Area 4 known as Glenoch). The property is not listed.
- 1.10 The area is characterised by terraced Edwardian properties of distinct detailing. The terrace of which the application site forms apart, is relatively uniform in its appearance from the street elevation. There is, however, greater variation in character and appearance along the rear elevation with a number of properties having benefitted from rear extensions and alterations.
- 1.11 To the rear of the site lies 43-60 Tudor Close, a 4 storey block of apartments. To the east lies no.3 Glenilla Road whilst to the west lie the rear gardens of those properties fronting on to Belsize Avenue. A number of trees lie beyond the rear boundary of the site.

## **2.0 PLANNING HISTORY**

- 2.1 The property benefits from an extant permission (13/5538/P) for a single storey rear extension, installation of new windows throughout, 6 skylights at roof level and the enlargement of the original basement including front and rear lightwells.
- 2.2 Planning permission for the erection of a dormer window (as partially constructed) was refused under 2014/6097/P. The reasons for refusal states:

*“1. The proposed rear dormer, by reason of its scale and bulk along the roof ridge and its positioning in relationship with the existing roof form would be an incongruous additional that would harm the appearance of the host building, disrupt its symmetry with the adjoining terrace properties and would unacceptably alter the private and public views form the public domain and neighbouring gardens. The proposal therefore fails to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Belsize Park Conservation Area, and the proposed extension would set an unwelcome precedent. This is contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) and CS14 (promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden’s heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Policies.”*

- 2.3 Following the refusal of planning permission 2014/6097/P the scheme has been re-assessed. The current proposal seeks to positively address the concerns raised, as detailed in Sections 6 and 7 below.

### **3.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 3.1 Further to the refusal of planning permission 14/6097/P, the proposed roof level extension has been re-assessed. The revised design, the subject of this application, positively engages the principles of good design and traditional window hierarchy with the objective of conserving the significance of the conservation area and protecting neighbouring amenities.
- 3.2 The dormer window, as now proposed, would be formed in lieu of the rooflights approved under application 2013/5538/P or those proposed in a recently submitted application associated with the design changes to the rear extension, basement and boundary walls.
- 3.3 It would be located 0.5m below the ridge of the roof and 0.7m above the upper eaves of the mansard roof. The proposal would be located centrally on the roof slope, set 2.6m from the flank walls of the property with a width of 2.2m, a depth of 2m in depth with an overall height of 1.3m. It would be completed with a lead flat roof and cheeks.
- 3.4 Full details of the proposed dormer window are shown on the application drawings.

## **4.0 DESIGN & ACCESS COMPONENT**

### **Amount**

- 4.1 The proposed dormer window extension would simply provide additional head height within the existing roof space, thereby facilitating the use of this existing space as habitable accommodation in association with the main property.

### **Scale and Appearance**

- 4.2 Following an earlier refusal of planning permission for a dormer window extension, amendments have been made to the scale and appearance of the proposal. The dormer window, as now proposed, is two windows wide with an overall width of 2.2m, a depth of 2m and a height of 1.3m. It would be located centrally on the roof slope and above the existing dormer window located on the mansard roof. The proposal would be finished with lead roof and cheeks, in keeping with existing dormer window materials already found on the property and elsewhere in the locality.
- 4.3 The scale and proportions of the dormer window have been reduced so it reflects the traditional window hierarchy typically found on Edwardian properties. The dormer window extension is therefore subordinate in form to the scale and proportions of the windows on the ground and first floor and the existing dormer window positioned on the rear mansard roof.
- 4.4 The dormer window would not dominate the rear roof slope as viewed from vantage points to the rear of side. With reference to the proposed Section A-A Drawing, the proposal is stepped back from the mansard roof below and would not appear visually dominant or prominent in profile.

### **The Use**

- 4.5 The residential use of the property as a single dwelling is unaffected by the proposals and the proposed dormer would simply facilitate the optimal use of the existing roof

**Hedley Clark**

Karen@hedleyclark.co.uk  
www.hedleyclark.co.uk  
Tel: 01420 489851 or 07766 650569

space (which is served by rooflights and benefits from extant permission for additional rooflights). No change in use is proposed as part of the proposal.

**Access**

- 4.6 No change is proposed to the main pedestrian access to the site from Glenilla Road. Access to the converted roof space would be via an internal staircase.

**Layout**

- 4.7 The proposals seek to enhance the original layout of the property to provide an improved standard of accommodation. The internal changes to layout do not require the benefit of planning permission.
- 4.8 Access to the converted roof space would be via a staircase leading from the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor landing area.



## **5.0 PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

### **National Planning Policy Framework**

- 5.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development which lies at the heart of decision making. Paragraph 14 makes it clear that development that accords with an up to date Local Plan should be approved without delay and where the development plan is absent, silent or out of date, permission should be granted unless any adverse impact of doing so would significantly outweigh the benefits or specific NPPF policies indicate development should be restricted.
- 5.2 Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning. Paragraph 58 requires development to respond to local character, reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials whilst not preventing or discouraging innovation.
- 5.3 The NPPF specifically states that design policies should avoid unnecessary detail and not be unduly prescriptive. Paragraph 60 goes on to state that *"Planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles."*
- 5.4 The Framework encourages design to secure the optimal and efficient use of a site whilst responding to local character and history.
- 5.5 Paragraph 126 recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource and seeks to conserve them in a manner appropriate to their significance. It is appropriate to consider the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the local character and distinctiveness.

5.6 The Frameworks makes it clear that an application in compliance with development plan policy should be approved without delay.

**Development Plan**

5.7 The relevant policies of the Core Strategy & Development Policies include:

- CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction
- DP24 Securing high quality design
- DP25 Securing Camdens Heritage
- DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

5.8 Camden Planning Guidance, updated in 2013, is also relevant and in particular;

- CPG1 Design
- CPG6 Amenity

5.9 The Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement (2002) is also a material consideration for the purposes of this proposal.

## **6.0 PLANNING POLICY COMPLIANCE**

### **NPPF**

- 6.1 The NPPF makes it clear that good design is a key component of sustainable development and that heritage assets should be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance. As demonstrated in detail below, the dormer window is sensibly proportioned, aligned with the window below, would not dominate the roof slope and uses appropriate and traditional materials. The proposal is well designed and would not harm the significance of the conservation area and complies with the requirements of the NPPF.
- 6.2 In addition to the above, the proposal would optimise the use and function of the property and meet the needs of the present occupiers without compromising the ability of future generations to come. The proposal therefore comprises sustainable development, consistent with the NPPF and for which there is a presumption in favour.

### **Development Plan**

- 6.3 Consideration has been given to the prevailing development plan policies. Every effort has been made to ensure the proposals, whilst meeting the expectations of modern day living, do not harm the architectural quality and integrity of the existing building and also ensure that the significance of the conservation area is not compromised. To that end, the proposed development would be executed to a very high standard as part of a comprehensive programme of works to upgrade the function and appearance of the property, respecting townscape character and local distinctiveness, in accordance with policies CS14 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies.

### **CPG1 – Roof extensions**

- 6.4 Policy CPG1 deals with matters of design and Section 5 relates to roof extensions in particular. Paragraph 5.7 states that roof alterations (which includes dormer window

extensions) is permissive of such development subject to compliance with a number of criteria, each of which is addressed in turn below.

- The area is characterised by dormer window extensions. The terrace of which the application property forms apart includes dormer window extensions on both the front and rear roof slopes, with a significant number of properties locally benefitting from these features. The principle of dormer windows is therefore clearly an established form of roof addition within the terrace and area generally.
- The dormer window is architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building. It is modest in its proportions (discussed below) and respects traditional window hierarchy patterns. The scale of the dormer window extension is modest, leaving a significant extent of the original roof slope uninterrupted. The proposal would not therefore dominate the roof slope, leaving the original roof form legible and would retain the overall integrity of the roof form.
- There are a variety of additions and alterations to roofs along Glenilla Road and neighbouring roads. The proposal does not introduce a form of extension which appear out of keeping in the locality and simply reinforces an established pattern of development at roof level.

6.5 Section 5 of CPG1 resists roof alterations where there is likely to be an adverse effect on skyline. The proposal would not have an adverse effect on the skyline due to its moderate scale, sensitive siting and extent of uninterrupted roof slope that would be retained. It further sets out criteria that if met may result in a dormer window extension being unacceptable. The proposal does not offend these criterion for the following reasons:

- There exist a number of dormer windows along the terrace and the proposal would not interrupt an unimpaired roof line or unbroken run of valley roofs.
- The buildings and terrace were designed with a mansard with slopign roof above. No additional storeys have been formed or mansards created.

- The application property is lower in height than those adjacent and the proposal would not add significant bulk or unbalance the architectural composition of the property.
- The application property and terrace do not have a rear roof line that is exposed to important London-wide and local views from public spaces.
- The roof construction and form are suitable for a dormer window, as proposed.
- The architectural style of the property would not be undermined by the proposal, for the reasons set out above.
- The roof extension by reason of its modest proportions, alignment on the roof and discreet position would not detract from the roof form.
- The scale and proportions of the original dwelling would not be overwhelmed by the dormer window. The original roof slope would remain fully legible and the modest proportions and scale ensure the proposal would not appear visually dominant or incongruous in view.

6.6 For the reasons set out above, it is held that the principle of a dormer window extension is acceptable under Policy CPG1. In such circumstances, Policy CPG1 provides additional specific guidance about the design of such additions. In particular, paragraph 5.11 states that roof dormers should be sensitive changes that maintain the overall structure of the existing roof form. Proposals that achieve this will generally be acceptable, provided a number of circumstances are met. The proposal meets the identified circumstances in the following way;

a) the pitch of the existing roof is sufficient to allow adequate habitable space without the creation of a disproportionately large dormer and does not require any change to the ridge height. As evidenced on the application plans, including Section A-A, the existing roof form enables adequate habitable space to be created with the modestly proportioned dormer window proposed.

b) the dormer window does not cut through a hipped roof. A 50mm gap is retained between the dormer and the ridge, 50mm between the dormer and the eaves level and 50mm to the party walls either side. The proposal significantly exceeds the standards set out

in CPG1 in this regard, highlighting the modest proportions and extent of uninterrupted roof that would remain legible.

c) the roofscape along the terrace and Glenilla Road more generally is not unbroken, with several properties benefitting from dormer windows and/or rooflights.

d)the proposed dormer window is 2 panes in width (#m) and therefore smaller than the #m pane window below it. The dormer window is smaller in depth, width and height than the window below it and it is centrally aligned above the window on the lower floor level. By virtue of the distances from the party walls, eaves and ridge, the dormer window appears as a separate small projection, subordinate to the form, scale and size of the windows below. The dormer window is centrally located and the cheeks are not excessive. The dormer window would not appear dominant or prominent on the roof slope and complies with the design guidance illustrated in Figure 4, page 42 of CPG1.

e)the dormer window would not obstruct the ridge line.

f)the materials compliment the main property and incorporate traditional materials (lead roof and cheeks and timber windows).

6.7 For the reasons set out above, the proposal accords with Policy CS14 of the Core Strategy, Policy DP24 and CPG1.

#### **HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

6.8 The Belsize Park Conservation Area Appraisal notes the townscape of the area. It states that;

*“Glenilla Road is less consistent in character having a variety of buildings of different ages, materials, styles and heights along its southern side. Sussex House is an overbearing flat block significantly larger than the other buildings in the street.”*

**Hedley Clark**

Karen@hedleyclark.co.uk  
www.hedleyclark.co.uk  
Tel: 01420 489851 or 07766 650569

- 6.9 The application site is an end of terrace property, with the properties fronting onto Belsize Gardens, which are more substantial in height/scale, backing on to its flank elevation. The properties along the terrace have benefitted from modern extensions and alterations over time. This variation is noted in the conservation area appraisal.
- 6.10 The dormer window is located on the rear roof slope and only glimpse views of it would be achievable from public vantage points. Indeed, by virtue of the alignment of the dormer window, the alignment of those properties fronting Belsize Gardens, its set back from the party wall, its modest depth (as shown on Section A-A) and existing landscaping, the extension would not be highly visible or prominent from public vantage points.
- 6.11 Whilst the dormer window would be visible from the private views from neighbouring properties, the proposed scale, proportions and extent of uninterrupted roof slope would preclude it from being visually dominant, incongruous or harmful.
- 6.12 The design of the proposal accords with the Council's design guidance and ensures the proposal retains the original architectural integrity of this non-listed property. The discreet position of the proposal together with its sensitive scale ensures no harm to the character of the property or the contribution it makes to the character of the area.
- 6.13 The proposal would afford appropriate protection to the significance of the conservation area, in accordance with the requirements of Policy DP25 of the Development Policies.

#### **IMPACT ON EXISTING RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

- 6.14 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers whilst Policy DP26 seeks to protect the amenities of neighbours by granting permission only for

**Hedley Clark**

Karen@hedleyclark.co.uk  
www.hedleyclark.co.uk  
Tel: 01420 489851 or 07766 650569

development that would not lead to harm by way of loss or privacy, overlooking, outlook and detrimental impact on daylight and sunlight. The objective of these policies is further reinforced by CPG6 which seeks to protect the amenities of both existing and new dwellings.

- 6.15 The property contains a number of existing windows serving habitable rooms on the upper floors. The additional window at roof level would not lead to a material increase in overlooking or loss of privacy. This conclusion was supported by the Council when assessing the dormer window proposed under 14/6097/P.
- 6.16 The proportions and siting of the dormer window would not result in it having an overbearing visual impact or cause a loss of daylight or sunlight to any neighbouring occupier.
- 6.17 Neighbouring residential amenities are therefore protected and the relevant development plan policies complied with.
- 6.19 In summary and for the reasons provided in paragraphs 6.1- 6.18 above, the proposal is not in conflict with prevailing national and local planning policies.



## 7.0 OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7.1 The Officer report pertaining to refused permission 14/6097/P is relevant and for ease of reference the following section will provide a summary of how the proposal has positively responded to officer concerns.
- 7.2 In paragraph 2.2 it is noted that the proposed dormer window would “*sit awkwardly within the roof ridge due to its inappropriate design.*” In response to this, the dormer window has been fundamentally re-designed which has resulted in a substantial reduction in its overall size and improved proportions. This in turn ensures the dormer window extension does not dominate the roof slope, accords with the specific design guidance offered in CPG1 and protects the architectural integrity of the property.
- 7.3 The report goes on to conclude that the size and bulk of the dormer window would cause harm to the conservation area. For the reasons set out in paragraphs 6.1 – 6.18, the substantially reduced in size roof dormer would be barely visible from any public vantage points and when viewed from local private vantage points it would not dominate the roof slope, appearance of the property or appear incongruous. The modest size and bulk of the dormer window (refer to Section A-A) would not harm the significance of the conservation area.
- 7.4 The proposal would not result in the formation of an additional unit of accommodation, it is intended to allow a more efficient use of the existing roof space as part of the existing property. The amended design would not dominate the roof slope and accords with the Council’s design guidance for such additions (CPG1).
- 7.5 The Council considered the previous proposal to be “*poorly positioned*” such that it would “*undermine the architectural style of the host building in terms of scale and proportion*” and represent an “*overdevelopment*” when analysing the character of the area. In contrast, the revised design subject of this submission provides a centrally located dormer window that sits centrally on the roof slope and is aligned with the window below. The window respects traditional window hierarchy and proportionally

appropriate in relation to the windows below (respecting figure 4 of CPG1). The proposal does not dominate the rear roof slope or rear elevation and does not comprise an overdevelopment of the property.

- 7.6 It was concluded that the former proposal fundamentally altered the roof form, harmful to the character of the host property and conservation area. The proportions, scale and appearance of the dormer roof no longer fundamentally alter the roof form, with the proposal representing a modest addition at roof level that leaves a substantial element of roof uninterrupted. The character of the property is not prejudiced nor the significance or character of the conservation area.
- 7.7 The significant changes to the scale, proportions and siting of the dormer roof extension fully address the Council's previous concerns and result in a modest addition that complies with the NPPF and development plan policy.

## **8.0 CONCLUSIONS**

- 8.1 The proposed development would meet the needs of the occupiers without compromising future generation to meet their own needs and is therefore sustainable development consistent with the NPPF.
- 8.2 The proposal has been sensitively designed, proportioned and detailed to ensure no harm to the architectural integrity, character or appearance of the host property or wider terrace of which it forms apart.
- 8.2 The discreet position and modest scale of the dormer window would ensure no harm to the significance of the conservation area, with public views protected.
- 8.3 No detrimental impact upon existing residential amenity would result from the proposal.
- 8.4 basement, as constructed and in accordance with the BIA, is smaller than approved and no longer includes a rear lightwell. It extends only under the core of the original property and causes no harm to the built or water environment or the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.
- 8.5 The reasons for the refusal of a substantially larger dormer roof extension have been positively addressed.
- 8.6 The proposal complies with all relevant development plan policies and with central government advice in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. In our judgment no other material considerations weigh against it.
- 8.7 Accordingly we trust the Council will determine that the application for planning permission can be approved.