

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	15/08/2016
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	20/07/16
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Nora-Andreea Constantinescu			2016/3431/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
Flat 3 154 Iverson Road London NW6 2HH			Refer to 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>				
Alterations to rear roofslope for the installation of door providing access to proposed roof terrace at third floor level enclosed by new balustrade (Class C3).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refused planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>28</b>	No. of responses v	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A Site Notice was displayed on 29/06/2016 to 20/07/2016. Letters were also sent to adjoining neighbours.</p> <p>A comment was received from the occupier of Flat 1 at 154 Iverson Road regarding the restriction of building working hours.</p> <p><i>Officer comment: Noise from demolition and construction works is subject to control under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. You must carry out any building works that can be heard at the boundary of the site only between 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.</i></p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	N/A					

## Site Description

The application site is located on the southern side of Iverson Road and comprises a three storey terraced property with rooms in the attic.

The property has been extended previously at the rear with a third floor on top of the existing two storey outrigger, to provide a bathroom for Flat 3, which appears to have been in place for more than 4 years. The extension has a flat roof with a wooden balustrade in a poor condition. There is no existing access to flat roof. There are no planning or enforcement records in relation to this extension.

The site is surrounded by similar residential properties on both sides and rear.

The site is not located in a Conservation area and is not in the setting of any Listed Buildings.

## Relevant History

**2016/2033/P** – Flat 1, 154 Iverson Road – Formation of basement extension with front and rear light wells – **Pending Consideration**

## Relevant policies

### **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

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

### **London Plan (2016)**

Policy 3.5 – Quality and Design and 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

CS15 – 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 & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan**

Policy 2 – Design & Character

#### **Supplementary Guidance**

CPG 1 – Design (2015) – Section 5

CPG 6 – Amenity (2011) – Section 7

### 1. Proposal

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for the:

“Alterations to rear roofslope for the installation of door providing access to proposed roof terrace at third floor level enclosed by new balustrade (Class C3).”

1.2 The proposal comprises the following elements:

- Installation of new glazed door at the third floor which alters the eaves of the existing roof form
- Installation of new timber deck above existing WC roof (1.4 x 3.4m)
- Installation of new metal and timber privacy screen 1.8m high and new metal balustrade 1.1m high

### 2. Design & Heritage

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 CPG1 (Design), at paragraph 5.7 provided further clarity to this policy stating that *“roof alterations are likely to be acceptable if they are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form”*. It is noted that some of the adjoining properties with the application site have been extended previously with a roof extension such as dormers above the eaves or doorways to access the roofs of outriggers below eaves level. However, the proposed glazed door is insensitively introduced through the eaves of the roofline, causing detrimental harm to the integrity of the roof form by interrupting the existing unimpaired eaves line of the terraced row. As such, this is considered an unacceptable element of the proposal.

2.2 Policy 2 (Design & Character) of Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan insists on high quality design which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead. Furthermore, the paragraph A14 states that *“Roof extensions and loft conversions should fit in with existing rooflines and be in keeping with existing development.”* This further empowers the unacceptability of the proposed roof extension which unsympathetically alters the existing eaves roofline and is considered a poor design solution.

2.3 Regarding the balcony, paragraph 5.24 of CPG1 requires that careful consideration should be given to the detailed design to reduce the impact on the existing elevation, and form an integral element. The existing rear elevation has been previously altered without planning permission as stated above in the site description. The current appearance of the existing rear elevation is poor and a balcony (both railings and screening) in that location would further undermine the character of the existing building and Fortune Green and West Hampstead area.

2.4 The proposal also includes the addition of a privacy screen along the western boundary with the property at no 156, to remove the opportunity for overlooking. Whilst this element may, to a small degree, mitigate concerns of overlooking neighbours, this would not outweigh the harm caused by the unsympathetic appearance of the screen which would add clutter in a prominent position. As such, this element is considered unacceptable.

### **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 the amenity which includes visual privacy and overlooking, overshadowing and outlook. 3.2 In the CPG6 (Amenity), paragraph 7.9 further guidance is given which states that *“When designing your development you should also ensure the proximity, size or cumulative effect of any structures do not have an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers.”*

3.2 Policy 2 (Design & Character) of Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan states that extensions in order to achieve a high quality design they need to be in character and proportion with their context and setting, including relationship to any adjoining properties.

3.3 The neighbouring properties at nos 152 and 156 have received permission and implemented roof terraces at the second level of the two storey outrigger. The proposed balcony at no 154 is located at a higher level than any other existing terraces at the adjoining properties or along the terraced row, causing detrimental harm to the neighbouring amenities through overlooking. As such, the proposed balcony will be contrary to policy DP26, CPG6 and Policy 2 of Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, therefore is considered an unacceptable element of the proposal.

### **4. Conclusion**

4.1 It is considered that the design of the proposed roof alterations, balustrading and screening would cause detrimental harm to the host building and to the row of terraced properties for which it forms a part. As such the proposal is considered unacceptable and contrary to Policy DP24 of Camden’s Local Development Framework.

4.2 The proposed terrace is considered to cause detrimental harm to the neighbouring amenities in terms of overlooking due to its location and positioning. It is therefore concluded that the proposed balcony is unacceptable and contrary to Policy DP26 of Camden’s Local Development Framework.

### **5. Recommendation**

5.1 Refuse planning permission.