

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>03/11/2015</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>15/10/2015</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Carlos Martin			2015/5085/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
Flat 14 Westfield 15 Kidderpore Avenue London NW3 7SG			Refer to draft decision notice.	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Erection of extension over existing roof terrace.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>146</b>	No. of responses	<b>07</b>	No. of objections	<b>06</b>
			No. electronic	<b>05</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Press notice published from 24/09/2015 to 15/10/2015.  Site notice displayed from 18/09/2015 to 09/10/2015.</p> <p>7 objections received based on design and conservation and amenity grounds.</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	Redington/Frognaal CAAC: No response.					

## Site Description

The application site is the Former Westfield College site, which was redeveloped in the past to provide linked blocks of residential flats. The site is bounded by Kidderpore Avenue, Croftway and 302-314 Finchley Road. It is located within the Redington/Froggnal Conservation Area.

The development was built in 2000 with red brick elevations and red tiled roof. Apartment 14 to which this application relates is on the top floor of the northwest corner of the development on the Kidderpore Avenue elevation. This north west end of the building has a hipped end roof. The hipped end roof slope is punctuated by flat roof dormer windows and a balcony with brickwork balustrades and a significant brickwork chimney feature.

## Relevant History

Planning permission was granted in 1994 for part redevelopment and part conversion to provide up to 232 residential flats with ancillary leisure facilities, a basement car park with 241 spaces and a Doctor's Surgery. There is no relevant planning history relating to the flat that is the subject of this application. Listed below is the history relating to other units within the block.

**2013/2238/P:** pp **granted** for Replacement of brick balustrade with metal balustrade to side elevation of fourth floor residential flat no. 72.

**2005/3497/P:** pp **refused** for the erection of a single storey conservatory to enclose a roof terrace at third floor level at flat 71 Westfield.

### Reasons for refusal:

The proposed single storey conservatory, by reason of its design, bulk and position, would be detrimental to the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the Redington/Froggnal Conservation Area.

**PWX0103929:** pp **granted** for the erection of a conservatory to enclose an existing inset roof terrace at fifth floor level, at flat 99. 11/03/2002.

**2015/4681/P:** Erection of conservatory on existing inset roof terrace and associated alterations at flat 71. **Currently being considered.**

## Relevant policies

### **National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

### **London Plan 2015**

### **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**

CPG1 (Design) 2015, chapters 3 (Heritage) & 5 (Roofs, terraces and balconies).

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011, chapters 6 (Daylight and sunlight) & 7 (Overlooking, privacy and outlook).

### **Redington/Froggnal Conservation Area Statement 2000.**

## Assessment

### Proposal

1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a roof extension onto the existing balcony. The extension would be 1.0m x 2.0m in area and 1.2m higher than the existing brick balustrade. The extension would be constructed with matching brickwork and a glazed elevation facing to the remaining terrace.

### Main planning considerations

2. The main planning considerations relate to the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building, the streetscene and the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area and the impact on the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the surrounding residential properties.

### Design and conservation

3. Policies CS14 and DP24 seek to ensure all development is of the highest quality design and considers the character, setting, context and form of neighbouring buildings. Both policies advise that the Council will not grant planning permission for alterations and extensions that it considers cause harm to the architectural quality of the existing building or surrounding area. Furthermore Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas.
4. The proposed alteration to the balcony is considered to be relatively modest in terms of scale and would be built with matching materials. However, it would appear as an inappropriate addition to the building due to its location within the hipped end roof slope. The extension would involve extending the ridge line, which is considered to be unsympathetic and would make the extension appear out of scale and proportion to that of the existing roof. The proposal would therefore result in the alteration to the roof profile, which would significantly change the integrity of the existing roof form, introducing an incongruous feature that is considered harmful to the architectural style of the building and the streetscene of this part of the conservation area as it would be visible from the public realm.

### Amenity

5. The proposed increase in bulk is not considered to be such as to result in a significant loss of light and increased sense of enclosure in neighbouring properties. In terms of overlooking, the proposed new windows would not afford substantial additional views from those already existing and therefore it is considered that there would not be any significant loss of privacy and in this sense the proposal would comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF.

### Recommendation

6. Refuse planning permission