

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>12/09/2017</b>	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>25/08/2017</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Evelyn Jones				2017/2954/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
93 Redington Road London NW3 7RR				See 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>							
The addition of a roof terrace to the rear of the property at second floor level along with the subsequent removal of two dormer windows and changing existing PVC windows to timber.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Householder Application</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		<b>Refer to Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections No. of support	<b>01 00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		A site notice was erected 28/07/2017 expiry date 18/08/2017 A press notice was published 04/08/2017 expiry date 25/08/2017  One objection from the neighbouring property 91 Redington Road stating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removing the dormers and creating a terrace would expose side windows resulting in a loss of privacy</li> <li>• A loss of privacy to the garden</li> <li>• If there are any plans to remove the tree in the rear garden this should be refused</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local Resident's Groups</b>		No comments received					

### Site Description

The subject site is a large three storey detached residential dwelling (Class C3) located on the west side of Redington Road close to the junction with West Heath Road and Hampstead Heath.

The application site lies within the Redington Froggnal Conservation Area and has been identified within the conservation area statement as a positive contributor to the Conservation Area but is not listed.

## Relevant History

**2017/2971/P** – Erection of single storey ground floor rear extension with roof terrace above, and replacement of all PVC windows with timber framed windows. **Granted 12/09/2017**

**9500744R2** - Removal of existing front entrance canopy and replacement with a larger version. **Granted 08/03/1996**

## Relevant policies

**National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**

**London Plan (2016)**

**London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017**

A1 - Managing the impact of development

D1 - Design

D2 - Heritage

**Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 Design (2015)

CPG6 Amenity (2011)

**Redington and Frognal Conservation Area Statement (2000)**

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal:

1.1 The application proposes the removal of two existing rear dormers at second floor level and the installation of a roof terrace.

1.2 No alterations to the front of the property are sought.

1.3 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design – the impact the proposal would have on the host building and the wider Redington Frognal Conservation Area
- Amenity – the impact the proposal would have on neighbouring occupiers

### 2. Design

2.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest quality design in all developments. Policy D1 states that developments should consider the character, setting, context and form and scale of neighbouring buildings and the quality of materials to be used. As the site is within the Redington Frognal Conservation Area, policy D2 which states that developments within conservation areas must preserve or enhance the conservation area.

2.2 CPG1 Design reiterates this view and states that of roofs where there is an established form of roof development that alterations to affecting this would be resisted. It is also made clear that where a building's design and complete composition would be affected by alterations to the roof this would not be considered favourably by the Council.

2.3 The property is a large detached red brick building dating from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. Within the immediate area properties are characterised by second storey dormer windows on all roof slopes. The two rear dormer windows are characteristic of these properties and as such there is a presumption of retention.

2.4 The two dormer windows in question are to the rear of the property and project 1.5 from the rear roof slope. The windows are white timber framed traditional windows and match those in all other windows at the property. The dormers have pitched roofs and emulate the original two storey rear extension and the form of the main roof of the property.

2.5 The loss of these dormer windows would be detrimental to the character of the host property and would harm the form of the existing roof and character of roofs in the area. The replacement of a terrace at second floor level is not considered to be in keeping with the rear elevation of the property and is not an established feature of buildings in the area.

2.6 The application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

2.7 The applicant proposed to change existing UPVC windows on the side elevation of the property to timber windows to match the existing at the property. This alteration is welcomed and would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host property and the wider Redington Frogmal Conservation Area.

### **3. Amenity**

3.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore, the policy seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of neighbours and occupiers by only permitting development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 Amenity seeks for developments to be designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree.

3.2 The proposed terrace would be set in from the roof slope and largely screened from view by the existing roof and the large chimneys to either side shield the terrace from view by either neighbouring properties. It is therefore considered that the terrace would be adequately screened and would not be perceived to detrimentally impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. The terrace would not offer increased opportunity for overlooking into windows or the gardens of the neighbouring properties and therefore the proposal would be acceptable in amenity terms.

**Recommendation:** Refuse Planning Permission