

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		06/10/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		01/09/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Oluwaseyi Enirayetan				2016/3950/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
6 Mill Lane LONDON NW6 1NS				Refer to decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Enlargement of existing rear dormer.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	4	No. of responses	0	No. of objections	0
				No. electronic	0		
Summary of consultation responses:		NONE					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		The site is not within a conservation area and there are no statutory local groups.					

Site Description

The site is located on the south side of Mill Lane. It comprises a 4-storey mid-terrace dwelling house. The site is not a listed building and is not within a conservation area.

Relevant History

2011/4224/P - Installation of sliding doors at rear ground floor level of dwelling (Class C3). **GRANTED 13/10/2011.**

2015/2604/P - Conversion of existing 5-bedroom maisonette on ground, first and second floors into one 1-bedroom flat and one 2-bedroom flat, plus erection of cycle and refuse stores in the front garden – **GRANTED 07/01/2016.**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 (Design) – 2015; Chapter 5.

CPG6 (Amenity) – 2011

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the replacement and enlargement of existing dormer to rear roof slope

Revisions

The proposal was amended at the officer's request in line with guidance. It was further suggested that the proposal be revised to retain the current design and location, but slightly bigger in size. However, the applicant did not wish to amend the design.

Assessment

The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are:

- a) The design and impact on the appearance of the host building and surrounding area
- b) Neighbouring amenity.

Design

Policy DP24 states the council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; and
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed.

In Paragraph 24.7, it also requires development to consider:

- the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;
- the composition of elevations

Paragraph 24.13 further reiterates that 'Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings. Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation'.

Paragraph 5.8 of CPG1 also states that a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.

Policy DP24 paragraph 24.13 also advises that 'Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions.' This is reiterated in Camden's Planning Guidance (CPG1) which provides specific advice on the assessment of applications for roof level alterations or extensions. In paragraph 5.13 it states that 'the presence of unsuitably designed new or altered dormers on neighbouring properties will not serve as a precedent for further development of the same kind'.

Along the terrace and surrounding areas are a number of rear dormers. The majority of rear dormers along the terrace which this application forms a part of have similar designs. The roof extension at No 12 Mill Lane, which sits uncomfortably within the established pattern of dormer development, has been in place for over 4 years and therefore immune from enforcement.

The applicant in support of their proposal made reference in their design and access statement to Paragraph 5.11 of the CPG1, which states 'Alterations to, or the addition of roof dormers should be sensitive changes which maintain the overall structure of the existing roof form. Proposals that achieve this will be generally considered acceptable providing that the following circumstances are met'. Whilst I acknowledge that the proposal complies with some of the guideline, such as the windows relating to façade below, and the 500mm gap between the dormer and ridge (This is inconsistently annotated as 400mm on the section). However, the dormer seems large and tall and does not depict an original styled dormer with separate small projections on the roof surface or single dormer placed centrally. Furthermore, the design of the proposal will interrupt the roofscape, would unbalance the roof form and spoil the aesthetic quality of the roof. The proposed development by reason of its location would harm the host building, terrace and streetscene particularly due to its visibility from Mill Lane.

Amenity

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."

The proposed dormer is considered to comply with guidance and is not considered to harm the amenity of neighbouring properties due to its location within the roofslope.

Conclusion

It is considered that the enlarged rear dormer extension would be out of keeping with the rear roofline of buildings within this terrace.

Recommendation: Refuse on design grounds.