
Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Advisory Committee	Holly Lodge
Application ref	2016/0892/P
Address	17 Makepeace Avenue London N6 6EL
Planning Officer	Oluwaseyi Enirayetan
Comments by	14 April 2016
Proposal	Erection of a dormer window to the eastern side of the roof
Objection	Yes
Comment	Yes
Observations	Please see attached document

Documents attached

No details entered

Documents attached

[2016-0892-P, CAAC Comments](#)

About this form

Issued by	Contact Camden 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG
Form reference	20538379

Data Protection

No personal information you have given us will be passed on to third parties for commercial purposes. The Council's policy is that all information will be shared among officers and other agencies where the legal framework allows it, if this will help to improve the service you receive and to develop other services. If you do not wish certain information about you to be exchanged within the Council, you can request that this does not happen.

2016/0892/P	17 Makepeace Avenue	Erection of a dormer window to the eastern side of the roof	Oluwaseyi Enirayetan
<p>Objection</p> <p>Comments</p> <p>This development has a long planning history;</p> <p><u>2013/0163/P</u>, Erection of a single storey extension and conservatory at rear ground floor level. Erection of one side dormer window along with the conversion from a hip roof to gable end to the rear of a single dwelling house (Class C3).</p> <p>CAAC objected to the original design of roof, <i>The proposed dormer on west side of the roof is excessive in size, of a poor design because it has a flat roof and therefore does not complement the roof in the sympathetic manner expected in this conservation area. Dormers should be just big enough to allow access to the loft area have a pitched roof, tile sides and inset from the main supporting walls. The dormer is therefore in breach of the guideline that state; See Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area appraisal and Management Strategies for Roofs. "Dormers should be sited below the roof line and be subordinate in scale to the main roof. Dormer windows will normally be allowed at the rear and side if sensitively designed in relation to the building and other adjacent roofs. The particular character of the roofscape of that group of houses should be adhered to, and details such as the profile or splay of the roof slope, ridge tiles, and colour of clay tile must be matched"</i></p> <p>Dormer was changed from flat roofed box dormer to gable end dormer and approved. CAAC was not consulted over this change, other dormers in the vicinity are hipped.</p> <p>Development was carried out, 2 hipped dormers installed (one either side). Retrospective planning permission was sought;</p> <p><u>2013/6867/P</u>, Proposal: Retention of side dormer window at roof level to single dwellinghouse (Class C3).</p> <p>CAAC objected; <i>Although we have no objection to the second (eastern) dormer which allows the roof to match those on 4, 6, & 15 Makepeace Avenue the drawings appear to show a full width single storey rear extension which is contrary to the HLE CAAMS which state (page 47);</i></p> <p><i>'Part width extensions are appropriate on houses that originally had a shallow part-width extension, but on flat backed properties a shallower full width extension is likely to be more suitable'</i></p> <p><i>17 Makepeace had a shallow part width extension prior to this development. The</i></p>			

extension approved in 2013/0163/P by virtue of the materials to be used with the conservatory being fully glazed maintained the impression of a part width extension. The extension that appears in the current drawings is now clearly a full width extension.

As a comment, the drawings are of poor quality and possibly purposefully confusing. Drawing ATK/13/JM/BR6 which shows the new east dormer incorrectly shows the west dormer as having a gable end not the hipped gable actually built. Other drawings accurately reflect the roof that was built. Equally no reference is made in the application to the changes to the rear face of the building and no ground floor plan has been included.

Application was refused and enforcement action started.

In 2015 two further applications were made;

2015/2305/P, Single storey rear extension.

This sought permission for the as constructed rear extension under permitted development rights, permission was granted even though the extension did not match the plans approved in 2013.

2015/2303/P, Alterations to height of existing rear dormer and west dormer windows and removal of eastern dormer window and replacement with rooflight.

CAAC objected,

- a) The gable end side roof dormer is out of keeping with other side dormers in Makepeace Avenue which are hipped, in particular those at #15 (see photo below), and as such doesn't accord with CPG1 in repeating the established pattern (5.7). Although the gable end had previously been approved the design was a replacement for the original box dormer to which the CAAC objected.*
- b) The drawings should be annotated to indicate the required vertical distance of 500mm between the ridges of the dormers and the main roof as proposed in CPG1 (5.11) to ensure that this distance is incorporated into any Decision.*
- c) The roof light on the east slope appears to project significantly beyond the surface of the roof which is contrary to CPG1 (5.21 & 5.22) which requires roof lights to be flush with the roof profile.*
- d) The window in the west dormer should be obscured to avoid any chance of overlooking #15*

If the design were to be altered to accommodate the above comments the CAAC objections would be retracted.



Photo of 17MP at time of 2015/2303/P application, note hipped dormers

However permission was granted and the CAAC's comments were mainly omitted, in particular the west side dormer was approved as a gable ended dormer.

This latest application seeks to change the rooflight installed in 2015/2303/P to a gable ended dormer. If approved the house would effectively revert to how it was when retrospective permission was sought in 2013/6867/P except the dormers are gable ended.

We therefore **strongly object**. Our objection would be removed if the both dormers (new and existing) were made hipped and thus matched the local roofscape.

M Narraway, HLE CAAC, 6-Apr-16