

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	21/08/2015
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Ian Gracie			2015/3619/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
Flat 4, 11 and 13A Langland Gardens London NW3 6QD			Refer to Decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of roof extension; installation of twenty rooflights at roof level; installation of first and second floor rear terrace; enlargement of existing side dormer window on either side of building.				
Recommendation(s):	Refused			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	22	No. of responses	08	No. of objections	08
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Letters were sent to adjoining occupiers; a site notice was displayed on 24/07/2015 to 14/08/2015 and 22/10/2015 to 13/11/2015 (re-consult); an advert was also published in the local paper on 30/07/2015 for three weeks.</p> <p>A summary of the objections received are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The owner has not approached us with regards to to the proposed works. At present we would be unwilling for works to either partake or have works undertaken to our property. We would suggest that any works which are not mirrored on both sides of the house should be rejected for continuity purposes as this would damage the aesthetic of this attractive period building and be detrimental to the appearance of the street. • I will lose my privacy. I live at flat 1, 15 Langland Gardens which is almost directly underneath 13A's balcony to the rear;# • I doubt the lawfulness of this application as the owners of no.11 know nothing about the application. There are inaccuracies in the drawings submitted and no Design & Access Statement has been submitted. Both of the proposed sets of double dormers will face, and directly look into my bedroom/study window, and that of the floor below. The proposed terraces will cause loss of privacy and spoil the proportions of the house at the front and rear. 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p><u>The Lindfield-Langland Neighbourhood Association</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our objection is on the grounds of loss of privacy afforded to neighbours who will be directly overlooked by the new windows of the proposal. The drawings submitted do not accurately show this relationship and the effect on immediate neighbouring properties. • The lack of a Design & Access statement associated with the application demonstrates that effect on context has not been carefully considered in the application. • The LLNA is concerned for both the well-being of our neighbourhood building stock and our neighbours interest and we therefore see this application in its current form as detrimental to both. • We would like to reinforce our objections made on 3rd September. <p><u>Redington Frognaal Association</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street-facing balconies and terraces are not part of Conservation Area guidelines and we consider that glass balustrades will disfigure the conservation area. • We are concerned about the proposed dormer windows and their negative impact on the symmetry of the street scene at the front and direct overlooking of neighbours on either side. 					

Site Description

The application site is located on the west side of Langland Gardens and is within the Redington Fognal Conservation Area. The building is characteristic of this part of the Conservation Area which comprises semi-detached houses of three or four storeys with red brickwork and prominent dutch style gables. The site is located in the middle of a row of such buildings. The application site has a prominent entrance porch and decorative dressings to the gable. The building is part of a row of buildings that borders a large private garden to the rear of the application site which is accessible to the residents of Langland Gardens.

The row of buildings, of which the application site is part of a group, do not generally show signs of alteration at roof level other than at no.7-9 Langland Gardens where a number of alterations have been introduced including front and rear dormer windows.

Relevant History

Application Site

TP100222/19426 – Conversion of No. 13 Langland Gardens, Hampstead, into these self-contained flats. – **Granted 22 December 1959.**

8804724 – The change of use and conversion of a single family dwelling into four flats involving the formation of habitable rooms in the roof space and two extensions to the rear elevation at garden ground and first floor levels and terraces to the rear at ground first second and third floor levels as shown on drawing nos LG/S/1 2 3 4 5 6 7 as finally revised on 27.06.89. – **Granted 6 July 1989.**

7-9 Langland Gardens

8400600 - erection of a roof extension to form two self-contained flats and the formation of balconies at the rear of both properties as shown on drawing Nos.1 5 70/10 70/20-25 inclusive and 70/11-18 inclusive. – **Granted 4 July 1984.**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

Paragraphs 14, 17, 56-66, and 126-141.

London Plan (2015) Consolidated with Alterations Since 2011

Policy 7.4 – Local Character

Policy 7.6 – Architecture

Policy 7.8 – Heritage Assets and Archaeology

Local Development Framework

Core Strategy (2011)

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Development Policies (2011)

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Supplementary Guidance

CPG 1 – Design (2014) – Section 5

CPG 6 – Amenity (2011) – Chapter 7

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for the:

“Installation of twenty rooflights at roof level; Installation of first and second floor rear terrace; enlargement of existing side dormer window on either side of building.”

1.2 Following concern from officers, a number of elements from the originally proposed scheme were amended as follows:

- The front and rear dormers were removed to be replaced by rooflights, a total of twenty were added to the roof. Six to the front and rear and four at either side of the building.
- The originally proposed side dormer at upper roof level was originally reduced and then replaced with four rooflights.
- The rear terrace at roof level was removed from the proposed plans;
- The terraces to the front at second floor level were removed from the plans.

2. Design & Heritage

Design

- 2.1 Policy DP24 states that developments will be expected to consider the “character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings” and “the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed.”
- 2.2 Furthermore, CPG1 (Design) at paragraph 5.7 states that roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where there is an established form of roof addition where continuing the pattern of development would help re-unite a group of buildings and townscape.
- 2.3 As stated above, the application site is part of a group of similarly designed houses ranging from three to four storeys which all have distinctive and visible roof slopes. It is apparent that, generally, the original roof forms remain amongst this group of buildings apart from the alterations at no.7-9 which were granted in 1984.
- 2.4 This application proposes to erect a roof extension to infill the area between the roof slopes. It is considered that this will undermine the architectural integrity of the host property which does not respect the character and proportions of the existing building and is considered unacceptable.
- 2.5 The proposal for this site does not reunite the design of roof form of this group of buildings. Therefore it is considered that the proposals do not respect the character and scale of the neighbouring buildings and the proposal does not therefore accord with policy DP24 of Camden’s Local Development Framework.

Rooflights

- 2.6 With particular regard to rooflights, CPG1 at paragraph 5.21 and 5.22 states that rooflights can have an adverse upon the character and appearance of buildings and streetscapes. This can occur where they are an incompatible introduction into an otherwise uncluttered roofscape, or where they conflict with other architectural roof elements. It goes on to state that conservation area with prominent roof slopes may be so sensitive to changes that even the installation of roof lights may not be acceptable.
- 2.7 As stated above, the application site retains its original features including its prominent roof slope and dutch gables which are considered positive features to this part of the conservation area. A feature which is consistent throughout this area. As such, it is considered that the introduction of twenty rooflights to the host building discords with the positive original features of the building. The introduction of so many rooflights would add harmful clutter to the roofscape.

Side dormers

- 2.8 CPG1, at paragraph 5.11, requires that roof dormers should be read as separate small projections on the roof slope. The existing building currently has a single dormer on either side of the roof slope. This application proposes to enlarge these dormer windows to provide further light into the existing property. However, the enlarged dormer is considered to be an overly burdensome feature to the roof slope which does not respect the scale and proportions of

the host building. There are also other concerns with the dormer with regards to the amenity of adjoining occupiers. This will be discussed further in section 3.

- 2.9 It is considered that the proposed enlargement of the side dormers does not accord with design guidance or policy DP24 of Camden's Local Development Framework.

Rear Terraces

- 2.10 CPG1 (Design) sets out a number of criteria which set out how rear terraces should be designed. They should be designed to consider:

- Detailed design to reduce the impact on the existing elevation;
- Materials;
- Use of setbacks and screens to reduce overlooking;
- Need to avoid creating climbing opportunities for burglars.

- 2.11 One half of the rear of the existing building has already been extended to provide a three storey rear extension with terrace at second floor level. This application proposes to introduce a rear terrace at both first and second floor level on the other half of the building. Due to the depth of the adjoining extension, a brick flank wall will prevent the opportunity for overlooking into the adjoining property. The depth of the terrace will be consistent with the depth of the adjoining extension which is considered acceptable.

- 2.12 However, an additional wall is proposed to separate the two terraces at second floor level. This is considered to be an overly dominant feature which does not relate to the host building. As such, it is considered that the design of the rear terraces do not accord with policy DP24 or the design guidance as set out in CPG1 and are therefore considered unacceptable.

Impact on the conservation area

- 2.13 Policy DP25 of the LDF requires all alterations and extensions within designated conservation areas to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the area.
- 2.14 As noted above, a key feature of this part of the conservation area is the buildings along Langland Gardens such as the application site for the positive architectural features which they bring. As already explained above, the proposals are considered to be an unacceptable addition to the host building as they would harm the architectural integrity of the host property and result in a cluttered appearance to a currently unaltered roofscape. The alterations would cumulatively undermine the uniformity of the existing roofscape. As such, it is considered that the proposal neither preserves or enhances the conservation area and does not therefore accord with the requirements of policy DP25 of Camden's Local Development Framework.

3. Amenity

- 3.1 Policy DP26 states that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity which includes visual privacy and overlooking, and overshadowing and outlook.

- 3.2 Paragraph 7.4 of CPG 6 (Amenity) provides further clarity and guidance on this policy which states that:

“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”

- 3.3 The proposal includes plans to enlarge the existing side dormers and introduce four rooflights along each side elevation of the building. It is considered that the additional windows will create the opportunity to overlook into the neighbouring properties at no.9 and no.15 Langland Gardens. However, it is accepted that this issue can be overcome by attaching a condition for obscure glazing and ensuring the window is fixed shut.

- 3.4 With the above guidance in mind, it is not however considered that the rear terraces will have any undue impact on the amenities of any adjoining occupiers by virtue of the screening measures that have been put in place and the long distance to the nearest visible residential occupier. The proposed terraces do not project beyond the extent of the existing extension on site which again prevents the opportunity for overlooking.

- 3.5 As a result it is considered that a condition could be attached to the planning permission which would ensure that the

proposal accords with policy DP26 of Camden's Local Development Framework.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 It is considered that the design of the proposed rooflights, side dormers and rear extensions are considered unacceptable as they are overly dominant features on what is currently an uncluttered roofscape. The additions are considered to also be out of context with the surrounding conservation area. As such, the proposal does not accord with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of Camden's Local Development Framework.
- 4.2 The proposed side dormers and rooflights by virtue of the opportunity to overlook into the adjoining properties are considered unacceptable and do not therefore accord with policy DP26 of Camden's Local Development Framework.
- 4.3 The applicant has failed to agree to a Section 106 Legal Agreement to secure a financial contribution towards repairs to the highway in the event of any damage which fails to accord with policy DP21 of the Camden Local Development Framework.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 Refuse planning permission