Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		19/02/2016		
		N/A		Expiry	ultation / Date:	29/01/20	016	
Officer			Application Nu	umber(	s)			
Obote Hope			2015/6488/P					
Application Address			Drawing Numb	pers				
35 Rudall Crescent London			Soo draft docis	See draft decision notice				
NW3 1RR				See drait decision notice				
PO 3/4 Area Tea	m Signature	C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer S	ignature			
Proposal(s)								
Erection of a rear dormer roof extension.								
Recommendation(s):	Refuse Planning Permission							
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission							
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:								
Consultations							1	
Consultations Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	05	No. of responses	03	No. of c	bjections	03	
	No. notified	05	No. of responses	03 03	No. of c	bjections	03	
	A site notice	was display		<b>03</b> 12/02/2	016 and a	press notice		
	A site notice published on	was display the 25/01/2	No. electronic red from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And	<b>03</b> 12/02/2 d 3 obje	016 and a	press notice		
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of	A site notice published on Objection from	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And I Crescent are as follow	<b>03</b> 12/02/2 d 3 obje /s;	016 and a ctions wer	press notice e received.		
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation	A site notice of published on Objection from • The site	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And I Crescent are as follow le of the overall develo	<b>03</b> 12/02/2 d 3 obje /s;	016 and a ctions wer	press notice e received.		
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of	A site notice of published on Objection from The side of the form the side of	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal ize and sca oss of priva	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And I Crescent are as follow le of the overall develo	<b>03</b> 12/02/2 d 3 obje vs; pment p	016 and a ctions wer	press notice e received.		
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation	A site notice of published on Objection from The s The lo Objection from The d	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal ize and sca oss of privac m 6 Gayton lormer woul	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And Il Crescent are as follow ile of the overall develo cy Crescent are as follow d result in the loss of th	<b>03</b> 12/02/2 d 3 obje vs; pment p	016 and a ections wer proposed, a	press notice re received. and;	e was	
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation	A site notice published on Objection from The si The lo Objection from The d the te	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal ize and sca oss of privation m 6 Gayton lormer woul rrace as an	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And I Crescent are as follow le of the overall develo cy Crescent are as follow d result in the loss of the whole;	03 12/02/2 d 3 obje vs; pment p vs; ne integr	016 and a octions wer proposed, a	press notice re received. and;	e was	
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation	A site notice published on Objection from The si The lo Objection from The d the te	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal ize and sca oss of privation m 6 Gayton lormer woul rrace as an	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And Il Crescent are as follow ile of the overall develo cy Crescent are as follow d result in the loss of th	03 12/02/2 d 3 obje vs; pment p vs; ne integr	016 and a octions wer proposed, a	press notice re received. and;	e was	
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation	A site notice of published on Objection from The s The lo Objection from The d the te Contri	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal ize and sca oss of privat m 6 Gayton lormer woul rrace as an ibute to the	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And I Crescent are as follow le of the overall develo cy Crescent are as follow d result in the loss of the whole;	03 12/02/2 d 3 obje vs; pment p vs; ne integr	016 and a octions wer proposed, a	press notice re received. and;	e was	
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice of published on Objection from The site of the site	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal ize and sca oss of privation ormer woul rrace as an ibute to the CAAC- no re	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And Il Crescent are as follow le of the overall develo cy Crescent are as follow d result in the loss of the whole; increase levels of over	03 12/02/2 d 3 obje vs; pment p rs; ne integr looking;	016 and a octions wer proposed, a	press notice re received. and; nost building	e was	
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation responses: CAAC/Local groups*	A site notice of published on Objection from The s The lo Objection from The d the te Contri Hampstead C Objection from The p	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal ize and sca oss of privat m 6 Gayton lormer woul rrace as an ibute to the CAAC- no re m Rudall Cl proposed do	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And Il Crescent are as follow le of the overall develo cy Crescent are as follow d result in the loss of the whole; increase levels of over esponse received.	03 12/02/2 d 3 obje vs; pment p rs; he integr looking; ciation a	016 and a octions wer proposed, a rity of the h	press notice re received. and; nost building	e was	
Adjoining Occupiers: Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice of published on Objection from The side of the side	was display the 25/01/2 m 33 Rudal ize and sca oss of privation ormer woul rrace as an ibute to the CAAC- no re m Rudall Ch proposed do mity of the	No. electronic ved from 25/01/2016 to 2016 to 15/02/2016. And Il Crescent are as follow le of the overall develo cy Crescent are as follow d result in the loss of the whole; increase levels of over esponse received.	03 12/02/2 d 3 obje vs; pment p rs; he integr looking; ciation a	016 and a octions wer proposed, a rity of the h	press notice re received. and; nost building	e was	

# Site Description

The site comprises of a two storey terrace house, located within a row of 5 terraces to the north side of Rudall Crescent, The group creates an appealing contrast to its Victorian neighbours forming a continuous two-storey terrace with white painted wood cladding, set back behind a brick wall with painted timber cladding to the first floor front under sloping roofs covered with interlocking concrete tiles. The site is a single family dwelling house and the predominant land-use in the area is for residential.

The site is not listed but lies within the Hampstead Conservation Area. Number 31-35 is considered to make a positive contribution to the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement.

#### **Relevant History**

06/07/1966 - Permission **granted** The conversion of part of the garage at 35 Rudall Crescent, Camden to form a play room and the provision of parking space in the front courtyard. Ref: 36156).

2013/8062/P- Alterations to the fenestration to the front and rear at ground, first floor and roof level for the replacement/installation of new windows and doors the erection of a single storey rear extension to the rear at ground floor level, the reconfiguration and installation of new windows to the rear elevation and the installation of new velux rooflight to the rear elevation. **Granted**, 12/03/2014.

2015/1167/P- Additions and alterations including installation of folding doors to the full width of garage door opening, alteration of ground floor front window to three panel folding doors; replacement of front and rear windows and doors and side light with aluminium frame, along with enlargement of waste and recycle store and installation of new velux rooflight to the rear elevation. **Allowed** on appeal on 04/11/2015.

Nos.37 and 39 Rudall Crescent

2015/6903/P - Erection of dormer to rear roof slope of each property. Pending consideration recommended for refusal.

# **Relevant policies**

# DF Core Strategy and Development Policies for applications

Core strategy:

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

# **Development policies:**

DP24 (Securing high quality design) DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

# Camden Planning Guidance 2013:

CPG1 (Design) Pages 9-14 and 35-38 CPG6 (Amenity) Pages 25-38

# Hampstead Conservation Area Statement 2001

Pages 28, 62 and 63

London Plan 2015 consolidated with amendments since 2011

Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8

# National Planning Policy Framework 2012

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

#### Assessment

#### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of dormer extension to the rear roof slope, the proposed extension would add an additional 21.6sqm of additional residential floorspace. The dormers would be lead clad, flat roofed with aluminium framed windows. The dormer would be 2.3m wide and 2.3m high and would be 1.2m below the roof ridge and 0.6m above the roof eaves.

#### 2.0 Assessment

- 2.1 The main considerations in relation to the proposal are the design and impact on the conservation area and the impact in terms of amenity. 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 The agent made reference in the design and access statement on previous decision which was allowed on appeal (2015/1167/P). However, no reference was made to the proposed dormer extension and the decision relates to the windows and doors to the front & rear elevations in regards to the proposed material used. Reference was also made of a previous discussion during a telephone conversation. Nevertheless, the application is assessed based on the information which was submitted which solely relates to the dormer extension, the material consideration used to determine this application consist of the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement and Local and National Planning Policy.
- 2.3 CPG1 design guidance advises roof alterations are unlikely to be acceptable where a *complete terraces or* groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design. The guidance further states dormers will not be acceptable where they are introduced to an unbroken roofscape.
- 2.4 The Hampstead Conservation area statement advises great care therefore has to be taken to note the appropriate context for proposals as insensitive alterations can harm the character of the roofscape with poor materials, intrusive dormers, inappropriate windows. In many instances there is no further possibility of alterations.
- 2.5 It is noted that the homogeneity of roofscapes as a significant contributor to the character of the Conservation Area. Given the regularity of the terrace, and the relative of lack of other rear dormer windows in buildings on this side of Rudall Crescent is an important consideration. With the exception of rooflights in the rear roof slope, the group of five properties do not have any dormers or roof extensions. The group are noted in the conservation area statement as creating *an appealing contrast to its Victorian neighbours forming a continuous two-storey terrace with white painted wood cladding, set back behind a brick wall.* The addition of dormers to these two properties is considered harmful to the host buildings, the terraced group and the Hampstead conservation area.
- 2.6 It is considered that the principle of a roof extension on the property would be inappropriate and unacceptable. Any form of roof addition would cause harm to the uniform appearance of the terrace. It is acknowledged that this application includes two properties and there is a current application for Nos.37 and 39 which also propose dormers. However this is not considered to justify allowing the works given the harm this would cause to the integrity of the terrace.
- 2.7 It is also important to note that the proposed dormers would not be of the same scale, therefore they further add to the inconsistent appearance of the terrace, which would harm to the host buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 2.8 The proposed dormer window would not appear overly-large in the context of the roof area and maintain acceptable separation from the roof's eaves and ridge which would limit the impression of its scale. However it would not align with any of the windows in the elevation below and makes no attempt to windows in the lower level, as required within CPG.

- 2.8 In light of the above it is considered that the proposed dormers are an unacceptable form of development that would fail to provide the high quality design expected by DP24 and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area as required by DP25 and it is recommended planning permission is refused on grounds of design.
- 2.9 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree." The proposed dormers are not considered to result in overlooking or loss of light and are considered acceptable in terms of impact on amenity.

#### 3.0 Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission