

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		19/09/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		15/08/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Raymond Yeung				2016/3202/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat C 58 Minster Road London NW2 3RE				See decision notice.			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of side dormer and insertion of rooflights into front, side and rear roofslopes.							
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	10	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		None received to date					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		None received to date					

Site Description

The application site is a 2 storey semi-detached converted property which consists of a number of flats located on different levels, there are 4 levels within the property. It benefits from an existing rear extension and proposal site Flat C is located on the upper levels. The site is not located within a conservation area nor is it a listed building. The road is on an incline rising from south to north with No.58 being higher than No.56 Minster Road.

Relevant History

2016/1509/P - Creation of front lightwell including works of conversion of existing basement floor to provide habitable room; reinstate window at front basement floor level to self-contained flat. Granted 21/06/2016

4464 - Alterations to ground floor at 58 Minster Road, Camden.- Granted 18/01/1968

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (chapters 7 and 12)

The London Plan (2016) (Policies 7.4, 7.6)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Camden Core Strategy (2010 – 2025)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies (2010 – 2025)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 (Design) – 2015; (Sections: 2 Design excellence, and 5 Roofs, terraces and balconies).

CPG6 (Amenity) – 2011(Sections: 6 Daylight and sunlight and 7 Overlooking, privacy and outlook)

Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan

Assessment

1 Proposal

- 1.1 The application proposes a new side dormer for the expansion of a bathroom within the loft space, this would measure 2.5 metres width, 1.7 metres height and 2.5 metres depth. It would be clad in zinc.
- 1.2 Two rooflights are proposed to the front roofplane, and an additional one to the side and two to the rear.
- 1.3 Revisions to the side dormer were received in an attempt to comply with CPG1 Design guidance 5.11b) (which seeks a 500mm gap between the proposed dormer and the ridge/eaves)..
- 1.4 Revisions were also received which removed the originally proposed enlargement of the existing rear dormer so that it would now remain as existing. Two rooflights are proposed instead.
- 1.5 The principal issues to be considered with the proposal are:
 - a) Design and Impact on the appearance of the host building and streetscene
 - b) Neighbouring amenity

2 Design and Conservation Area

- 2.1 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;*
 - b) *the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;*
- 2.2 In Paragraph 24.7, it also requires development to consider:
 - a) *the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;*
 - b) *the composition of elevations*
- 2.3 Paragraph 24.13 further reiterates that 'Development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings of buildings'.
- 2.4 Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1: Design) states that a roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable in circumstances such as the presence of unbroken runs of valley roofs or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions. It adds that a roof addition is likely to be unacceptable where the proposal would have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.
- 2.5 Paragraph 5.11 of CPG1 further states 'Alterations to or 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; amongst others, dormers should not be introduced where they interrupt an unbroken roofscape.
- 2.6 In Policy 2 'Design and Character' within the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, it states; *"All development shall be of high quality of design, which*

complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead. This shall be achieved by:

- i. Development which positively interfaces with the street and streetscape in which it is located.*
- ii. Development which maintains the positive contributions to character of existing buildings and structures.*
- iii. Development which is human in scale, in order to maintain and create a positive relationship between buildings and street level activity.*
- iv. Development which has regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of a place – including the scale, mass, orientation, pattern and grain of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces.*
- v. A presumption in favour of a colour palate which reflects, or is in harmony with, the red brick and London stock brick of existing development.*
- vi. New buildings and extensions that respect and are sensitive to the height of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting. Higher buildings in the Growth Area will need to have regard to their impact on the setting of the two immediately adjacent conservation areas, in order to avoid any negative impact on them.*
- vii. Extensions - and infill development - being in character and proportion with existing development and its setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties.*
- viii. A presumption against basement development more than one storey deep or outside the footprint of the property (excluding lightwells).*
- ix. The provision of associated high quality public realm.*

2.7 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 CPG1: Design 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'*.

2.8 The application site is located within a street residential properties characterised by its consistent appearance of paired semi-detached 2 storey properties. The street is characterised by roofscapes which are largely unbroken by front dormers ; however there are small roof lights in many of the roof slopes.

2.9 Therefore it is noted that the principle of dormers is not well established along Minster Road and therefore there is no strong precedent of side dormers along the street. However the front and side rooflights would be more discrete and are considered acceptable. No sections have been provided through the roofslopes and so in the event that permission were to be granted in future for the rooflights a condition would be added securing further details to ensure that the rooflight maintains a low profile on the roofslope.

2.10 The proposed side dormer this would measure 2.5 metres width, 1.7 metres height and 2.5 metres depth. It would be set back from the front façade by 3 metres and would be prominent in the streetscene.

2.11 Officers sought revisions to the design of the originally submitted side dormer in order to

make it more sympathetic to the host building and more subordinate to the roofslope. The dormer as revised does not respond to these considerations: being wider and out-of-character in a non-traditional partial hipped-roof design with zinc cladding.

2.12 The applicant has not specified the materials of the window framing, however it is considered that timber framing would be required, due to the predominance of timber framed windows on the street and the host building.

2.13 The most notable side dormer extension is at No.46 Minster Road within the close proximity. This was granted under 2005/0410/P, however what was built is not what was granted as the dormer that has been erected is of a larger size, is not hipped and is in different materials to the granted scheme.

2.14 A side roof extension amongst other works have been granted at No.57 Minster Road under ref: 2015/1505/P. This side dormer is considered more subservient and less prominent taking on a more traditional style of design with a flat roof and would be set back from the front façade of the house by 5.6 metres compared to the one proposed on this application which sees the set back at just over 3 metres.

2.15 Furthermore, there may be other existing dormers which have been previously developed in the further surrounding area. However, whilst there are examples of similar inappropriately sized and positioned extensions in the vicinity, it appears that they were constructed before Camden's current policies on roof extensions were adopted. These examples merely serve to illustrate the harm that such extensions can cause to their host buildings and surrounding area.

2.16 The proposed side dormer would be very visible at street level across the gap between 56 and 58, especially with 58 in its elevated position and the dormer's location close to the front elevation. The proposed dormer window, on account of its design, size and its position within the side roofslope would represent an incongruous feature to the detriment of the appearance of the building and wider streetscene. It would interrupt the view of the otherwise unimpaired roofscape of the pair of dwellings as seen from the street, and occupy a significant portion of the remaining roof. The proposed development by reason of its location would harm the host building, adjoining properties and streetscene.

3 Amenity

3.1 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."

3.2 No amenity concerns are raised by the proposal, by virtue of its location and position which would not directly face any adjoining openings. The proposed side dormer is therefore considered to be in compliance with policy DP26 and CPG guidelines and is acceptable on amenity terms.

4 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed roof extension, by reason of its design, form, position and location on the roofslope, would result in harm to the character and appearance of the building and the streetscene contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy, policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Policies and

policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission