| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | 07/07/2016 | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|--|---------------------------|------------|--|--|
| (Members Briefing) | | N/A / attached | | Consultation Expiry Date: | | | |
| Officer | | | Application N | umber(s) | | | |
| Amy Grace Douglas | | | 2016/2545/P | | | | |
| Application Addre | SS | | Drawing Num | bers | | | |
| Flat D 64 Menelik Road London NW2 3RH | | | 595/8 Rev C 595/7 Rev C 595/6 Rev C 595/5 Rev C 595/4 595/3 595/2 595/1 | | | | |
| PO 3/4 Area | Team Signatur | e C&UD | Authorised O | fficer Signature | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| Creation of terrace at fi | rst floor level. | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): Granted | | | | | | | |
| Application Type: Full Planning Permission | | | | | | | |

| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|----------|---|----|-------------------|----|--|--|
| Informatives: | Total to Brait Books, it dido | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | No. notified | 16 | No. of responses | 06 | No. of objections | 03 | | |
| | Six responses were received. Occupier of 64A Menelik Road: • An objection was received from the occupier of 64A Menelik Road, who raised concerns with regards to overlooking, privacy, and noise impacts; the potential that the proposal may set a precedent, and the use of glass rather than railings would not prevent impacts on privacy nor noise, the similar nearby glass terrace was built without planning permission. Officer comments: Nearby development built without permission do not form part of this assessment. Noise would not be a relevant planning | | | | | | | |
| Summary of consultation responses: | consideration given the residential nature of the property. Privacy concerns have been addressed via amended drawings which include a rear setback to mitigate any impacts. Precedence is not relevant to this application as each case is assessed in its own merits. Owner of 64A Menelik Road: • An objection was received from the owner of 64A Menelik Road with concerns regarding anti-social behaviour and noise. Officer comments: It is not considered that noise or anti-social behaviour would be a relevant material planning issue given the residential use of the subject site. | | | | | | | |
| | Owner/Occupier of 64B Menelik Road: An objection was received from the owner/occupier of 64B Menelik Road, noting the proposal would result in overlooking to the back gardens of neighbouring properties, in particular, the privacy of garden at Flat B would be impacted. Increased levels of noise from outdoor entertainment would result. The objector stated that no use of setbacks to minimise overlooking have been proposed. | | | | | | | |
| | Officer comments: The proposed drawings have been amended to include a rear setback of 1.4m to address the privacy impacts to the rear garden. Noise is not considered to be a material planning consideration due to the residential nature of the property. Owner/Occupier of 64C Menelik Road: • Two letters of support received from this household, noting the proposal would enhance the property and the building overall. | | | | | | | |
| | Owner/Occupier of 62 Menelik Road: No objection subject to the extension (sic) not protruding further at the back of the house than the current building as it would affect their light. | | | | | | | |
| | | building | e proposal does not g and is not an exte | | , | | | |

| | N/A |
|--|-----|
| CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify | |

Site Description

The application site is located on the north eastern side of Menelik Road. The property is a large double fronted two-storey plus loft dwelling, split into four flats, with a large two-storey rear side extension with a pitched roof and its own ground floor single storey side extension. The site is located adjacent to its junction with Minster Road to the south west. The site is not within a Conservation Area and the building is not listed.

Relevant History

No relevant history for 64D Menelik Road.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

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

London Plan 2016

Policy 3.5 – Quality and Design of Housing Developments

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

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan

Policy 2 – Design and Character

Supplementary Guidance

CPG 1 - Design (2015) Section 5

CPG 6 - Amenity (2015) Chapter 7

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the creation of a roof terrace at first floor level, to be erected above an existing flat roofed single storey side extension. It would be accessible for occupants of the first floor flat, 64D Menelik Road, with the proposed installation of sliding glass doors. The proposed roof terrace would be setback from the rear roofline by 1.4m.
- 1.2 Revisions were made to address concerns with the visual impact of the proposed roof terrace as the original proposal included sandblasted glass balustrading with a height of 1.8m to the rear. Metal balustrading and a 1.4m setback to the rear were proposed as part of the amended drawings package received 11/7/2016 to overcome design issues whilst mitigating any loss of privacy and overlooking to the rear garden.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are design and the impact of the development on amenity.

Design

- 2.2 The Council's design policies seek to achieve the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy DP24 states that development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and the quality of materials to be used.
- 2.3 Paragraph 5.24 of CPG 1 requires that consideration should be given to the detailed design to reduce the impact on the existing elevation, furthermore, with regards to terraces at roof level, paragraph 5.25 states that terraces will normally only be acceptable on the rear of properties. However it is considered the setback of the roof terrace from Menelik Road is sufficient so as to not cause significant harm in terms of visual impact to the streetscene.
- 2.4 The roof terrace is proposed to be setback by 1.4m from the rear of the roofline which is consistent with the CPG1 which specifies that handrails should be invisible from the ground and setbacks should be provided to minimise the impact. The proposed setback minimises the visual prominence of the roof terrace when viewed from the rear and allows for a consistent balustrading height. As such it is considered the proposal forms an integral element in the design of the elevation, consistent with the guidance provided in Paragraph 5.23 of CPG1.

Amenity

- 2.5 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" and that the Council will "aim to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight caused by a development on the amenity of existing occupiers."
- 2.6 The proposed roof terrace incorporates a suitable setback of 1.4m to prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to occupants of the rear garden below which is accessible from the ground floor. The neighbouring property to the south (79 Minster Road) has a non-habitable (staircase) window facing the roof terrace and, as such, would not be significantly impacted in terms of loss of privacy. It is considered that due to the residential nature of the property, increased levels of noise and anti-social behaviour would not result from the creation of the roof terrace. As such, the proposal would not detrimentally impact the neighbouring residents in terms of amenity.

3.0 Conclusion

3.1 The proposed creation of the roof terrace at first floor level is considered to relate well to the host building, is of an appropriate design by virtue of the reduction in the size of the terrace balustrading, and change in materials. Due to its size and location, it is considered the development would not significantly harm the amenity of any adjoining residential occupiers in terms of noise, loss of light, outlook, enclosure or privacy.

4.0 Recommendation

4.1 Grant conditional planning permission.

DISCLAIMER

The decision to refer an application to Planning Committee lies with the Director of Regeneration and Planning. Following the Members Briefing panel on Monday 18th July 2016, nominated members will advise whether they consider this application should be reported to the Planning Committee. For further information, please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'Members Briefing'.