Delegated Re	eport	Analysis sheet N/A		Expiry Date:	04/09/2015				
				Consultation Expiry Date:	20/08/2015				
Officer			Application N	umber(s)					
Tessa Craig			2015/3940/P	()					
Application Address			Drawing Numl	bers					
103 Greencroft Garder	19		Drawing Ivaiii	3010					
London NW6 3PE			See decision notice						
PO 3/4 Area Te	am Signature	C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Signature					
	3			J					
Proposal(s)									
Creation of a roof terrace with associated installation of railings and planters on the top flat roof.									
Recommendation(s):	Refuse Planning Permission								
Application Type:	Full Planni	ng Permission							

1 loads openly	Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice									
Adjoining Occupiers: No. notified A press notice was advertised on the 30 th July 2015 and a site notice was erected form 24 th July to 14 th August 2015. Support received from: 70 Canfield Gardens 67A Messina Avenue 103C Greencroft Gardens 103B Greencroft Gardens 68 Companyne Gardens Summary of consultation responses: Objections received from: Garden Flat, 105 Greencroft Gardens 9A Aberdare Gardens 70p floor flat, 105 Greencroft Gardens 9A Aberdare Gardens 70p floor flat, 105 Greencroft Gardens 9A Aberdare Gardens 70p floor flat, 105 Greencroft Gardens Aberdare Gardens (number not given) 113A Greencroft Gardens; The objections related to the following: Overlooking: Loss of Privacy; Precedence; Noise nuisance; Safety and security; Visibility in streetscene; Out of character with terrace; Impact on aesthetic integrity; CRASH (Combined Residents' Association of South Hampstead)- "Strongly object to the proposal due to impact on neighbour (noise and reverberation, security, water ingress). The Victorian property was not designed to support a garden roof terrace. The ballustrades are likely to be visible from the street. The balustrades were	Informatives:										
A press notice was advertised on the 30th July 2015 and a site notice was erected form 24th July to 14th August 2015. Support received from; 70 Canfield Gardens 67A Messina Avenue 103C Greencroft Gardens 103B Greencroft Gardens 103B Greencroft Gardens 68 Compayne Gardens 107 Greencort Gardens 9A Aberdare Gardens 107 Greencroft Gardens 9A Aberdare Gardens Top floor flat, 105 Greencroft Gardens Ground floor flat, 109 Greencroft Gardens Aberdare Gardens (number not given) 113A Greencroft Gardens; The objections related to the following: • Overlooking; • Loss of Privacy; • Precedence; • Noise nuisance; • Safety and security; • Visibility in streetscene; • Out of character with terrace; • Impact on aesthetic integrity; CRASH (Combined Residents' Association of South Hampstead)- "Strongly object to the proposal due to impact on neighbour (noise and reverberation, security, water ingress). The Victorian property was not designed to support a garden roof terrace. The balustrades are likely to be visible from the street. The balustrades were	Consultations										
erected form 24th July to 14th August 2015. Support received from; 70 Canfield Gardens 67A Messina Avenue 103C Greencroft Gardens 103B Greencroft Gardens 68 Compayne Gardens 0bjections received from; Garden Flat, 105 Greencroft Gardens 107 Greencroft Gardens 9A Aberdare Gardens Top floor flat, 105 Greencroft Gardens Ground floor flat, 109 Greencroft Gardens Aberdare Gardens (number not given) 113A Greencroft Gardens; The objections related to the following: • Overlooking; • Loss of Privacy; • Precedence; • Noise nuisance; • Safety and security; • Visibility in streetscene; • Out of character with terrace; • Impact on aesthetic integrity; CRASH (Combined Residents' Association of South Hampstead)- "Strongly object to the proposal due to impact on neighbour (noise and reverberation, security, water ingress). The Victorian property was not designed to support a garden roof terrace. The balustrades are likely to be visible from the street. The balustrades were	Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	34	No. of responses	13	No. of objections	08				
"Strongly object to the proposal due to impact on neighbour (noise and reverberation, security, water ingress). The Victorian property was not designed to support a garden roof terrace. *CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify The balustrades are likely to be visible from the street. The balustrades were		Support received 70 Canfield Gard 67A Messina Av 103C Greencroft 103B Greencroft 68 Compayne G Objections received Garden Flat, 105 107 Greencroft 9A Aberdare Gard Top floor flat, 10 Ground floor flat Aberdare Garde 113A Greencroft The objections receive Overlookive Loss of Percedenee Noise nui Safety aneeville Visibility in Out of char	d from: dens dens dens dens dens dens dens dens	ens ens ens ens ens ens ens encroft Gardens encroft Gardens encroft Gardens mber not given) ens; to the following:	ly 201	5 and a site notice w	/as				
The addition would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the house, the terrace or the conservation area.	comments:	"Strongly object to the proposal due to impact on neighbour (noise and reverberation, security, water ingress). The Victorian property was not designed to support a garden roof terrace. The balustrades are likely to be visible from the street. The balustrades were never part of the original design of the roof of this building or the terrace. The addition would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of									

Site Description

The subject site is located on the south side of Greencroft Gardens and comprises a Victorian brick, three storey property which is subdivided into flats. The subject flat comprises the upper two floors.

The property is located in the South Hampstead conservation area and noted as making a positive contributor to the conservation area, but is not a listed building.

Relevant History

None.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan March 2015

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

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

CPG1 (Design) 2015 - chapters 2, 3 and 5

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011 - chapters 6 and 7

South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011

Pages 8, 9, 23, 24, 28, 33, 37, 38, 44 and 46

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for a roof level terrace accessed via a proposed internal staircase leading to an access hatch in the roof. The roof terrace would be 26sqm with an additional 4.8sqm planted area on the east side of the terrace and a 0.9sqm worktop area on the south side of the terrace with a small planted area (0.6sqm) beyond it. The west edge of the roof terrace would include a planted wall which would appear to match the height of the proposed 1.1m high black metal balustrades surrounding the terrace.

2.0 Assessment

The main material planning considerations are considered to be:-

- i) the impact of the proposal on the character of the host building and the surrounding Conservation area;
- ii) the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Design

- 2.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.
- 2.2 CPG1 Design guidance advises the dimensions of roof terraces should be sufficient to accommodate a terrace without adversely affecting the appearance of the roof or the elevation of the property. A terrace will normally only be acceptable on the rear of the property. Hand rails should be invisible from the ground and the terrace should not result in overlooking of neighbouring properties. A terrace provided at roof level should be setback behind the slope of a pitched roof or behind the parapet of a flat roof.
- 2.3 The South Hampstead conservation area character appraisal and management strategy notes the wide variety of roof profiles play a very important role in maintaining the character of the conservation area. Proposals which alter existing roof profiles will be resisted, whilst uncharacteristic roof forms will be unacceptable.
- 2.4 The proposed balustrade is not set back from the front or rear roofslopes. The addition of the balustrade above the termination of the roofslope of the building is considered unacceptable in principle. The balustrades would be visible from the streetscene and from properties at the rear of the site and therefore considered harmful to the character of the host building, the terrace which the property forms a part and the Conservation Area.
- 2.5 The incongruous addition of balustrades to the building (which makes a positive contribution to the conservation area) would alter the roof profile and be harmful to the roof form. Whilst the applicant has proposed planting on the east and south portions of the roof terrace, this is considered unacceptable as it would be visible from the street and out of character with the other properties in the terrace.

Amenity

2.5 CPG6 Amenity states: "Development should be designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree. Spaces that are overlooked lack privacy. Therefore, new buildings, extensions, roof terraces, balconies and the location of new windows should be

carefully designed to avoid overlooking. The degree of overlooking depends on the distance and the horizontal and vertical angles of view. The most sensitive areas to overlooking are:

- Living rooms;
- Bedrooms;
- Kitchens; and
- The part of a garden nearest to the house."
- 2.6 Due to the distance from the roof terrace and the nearest residential windows, the proposal would not cause any overlooking. No loss of light would result from the terrace. Although the roof terrace may generate noise from use, it would be residential in nature and similar to if the occupants were using their existing balconies, therefore this is not considered a reason for refusal. It is not considered the proposal would result in security issues as the balustrade would surround the edge of the terrace and it would be unsafe to climb over to other properties.

3.0 Recommendation

3.1 The proposed terrace and associated railings, by reason of their visual prominence and incongruous addition to the roof, would harm the character and appearance of the host building, its semidetached pair and the wider South Hampstead Conservation Area, contrary to policies CS14 (promoting high quality places and conserving heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 (securing high quality design) and DP25 (conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies. Planning permission should therefore be refused.