

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	29/11/2017
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	02/11/2017
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Thomas Sild			2017/5284/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
2nd and 3rd Floor Flat 26 Primrose Gardens LONDON NW3 4TN			Site location plan, 26PG.P01.EX01, 26PG.P01.EX02, 26PG.P01.EX03, 26PG.P01.EX04, 26PG.P01 Rev A, 26PG.P02 Rev A, 26PG.P03 Rev A, 26PG.P04 Rev A		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Enlargement of existing front roof extension, erection of rear roof extension with roof terrace.					
Recommendation(s):		Refused			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:					
Consultations					
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Width of dormers excessive • Overbearing and incongruous • Does not respect surrounding fenestrations Officer's response: See section on design and heritage			
CAAC/Local groups* comments: Belsize CAAC		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larger than surrounding dormers • Attention drawn to previous appeal decision Officer's response: See section on design and heritage. Appeal allowed proposed front and rear roof extensions including a rear roof terrace in 2013 (ref 2013/1994/P). It is noted that the proposals for this site preserved a greater proportion of roof slope and apron to both front and rear. It should also be noted that there has been updated design guidance within the borough and the adoption of a new Local Plan since 2013.			

Site Description

No. 26 Primrose Gardens is a five storey (including loft and basement level) building, converted into flats, situated on the east side of Primrose Gardens. The building sits within Belsize Conservation Area for which it is noted as a positive contributor.

This application relates to the flat occupying the second and third (roof) floor levels.

Relevant History

- 2009: 2009/0504/P Refused alterations at roof level including French doors at rear, rear terrace area and new dormer windows to front, in connection with existing maisonette. The reason for refusal is stated as: *The dormer and terrace at the rear of the property, by reason of their bulk, width and scale in respect to the current roof form are considered to represent an incongruous feature to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building and the conservation area contrary to policies B1, B3 and B7 of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006.*
- 1984: 8400134 Granted permission for change of use and works of conversion to form two maisonettes on the ground/first floor and second/third

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012 London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

Belsize Conservation Area Statement (2003)

Belsize Conservation Area Design Guide

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 The proposed development is for the election of an enlarged front dormer window and rear dormer with attached roof terrace.

2. Amendments

2.1 Following officer advice, both front and rear dormers were reduced in width. The reduction was however not considered sufficient in bringing the scale and bulk of the extensions down to an acceptable level. The officer advised that the rear roof terrace should be set into the roof slope, to mitigate its prominence however the applicant was unable to agree this amendment.

2. Considerations

2.1 The principal material considerations in the determination of this application is:

- Design and heritage
- Amenity

3. Design and heritage

3.1 Local Plan policy D1 states that all development should respect local context and character under policy D2, the Council requires that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area.

3.2 A proposed enlargement of the front dormer and the addition of a rear dormer and roof terrace were refused for this property in 2009. It is considered that the reasons for refusal have not been overcome in relation to the rear alterations included in this current proposal.

Front dormer

3.3 The proposals would remove the existing 2m (w) x 1.3m (h) front dormer, and replace with a significantly larger extension measuring 4.3m (w) x 1.7m (h). This dormer would be set in 0.8m either side from the boundary parapets.

3.4 It is acknowledged that there are a variety of dormer sizes apparent along Primrose Gardens, however the prevailing character is of small dormers placed in varying positions but preserving a large amount of roof slope either side. The front facing windows on no. 26 decrease in size upwards from the ground to second floor. CPG guidance states that dormers form, scale and size should relate to the façade below, the surface area of the roof and be clearly subordinate to the windows below. This proposed dormer, by way of its excessive width, bulk and mass would appear unsympathetic and overly dominant on the roof slope, detracting from the hierarchy of window forms apparent on the host building. As such its addition would appear incongruous on the host building and contribute to the erosion of the terrace's established character and that of the wider conservation area.

Rear dormer and roof terrace

3.5 The existing rear roof slope contains two roof lights but has not undergone extension. Neighbouring properties on either side enjoy small scale rear dormers measuring around 2.2m (w) by 1.4m (h). the proposed rear dormer and measures 4.5m (w) by 2.4m (h) but has been set in by 0.8m from either side. The proposed dormer would open onto a facing roof terrace, set into the roof slope wither side but fully open to the rear face of the building with a contemporary style glazed balustrade.

3.6 CPG 1 design guidance states that when a terrace is provided within the slope of a pitch the adjacent tiles or slates should be kept unbroken above the eaves to a height of 1.1m in place of a balustrade. Any handrails required should be well set back behind the line of the

roof slope, and be invisible from the ground. This proposal fails to preserve an acceptable area of roof slope to the outward face of the terrace and as such results in an overly dominant, incongruous and visually intrusive addition in a highly prominent position to the rear of the host building, to the significant detriment of its character and that of the surrounding conservation area. Due to its height and positioning the glazed balustrade and fully open roof terrace would be visible to a large number of surrounding occupants.

3.7 As such this design detracts from the building's proportions and hierarchy of form and harms its character. This harm to the host building, contributes to the cumulative erosion of the character of the wider conservation area and damage to its value as a designated heritage asset. The development fails to respect local context and character and neither preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the conservation area. As such the proposals are contrary to both policy D1 and D2 of Camden Local Plan.

4. Amenity

4.0 Local Plan policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenity of communities, occupiers and neighbours is protected with any new development.

4.1 Given the existence of a front facing dormer window with similar sightlines to that proposed, there is not considered to be harm to neighbouring amenity by way of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy.

4.2 To the rear, there is a sufficient separation distance of over 30m across the back gardens to the rear of the dwellings along Antrim Road to mitigate potential amenity impact to occupants of these dwellings. Adjacent gardens along Primrose Gardens are already overlooked by a large number of rear facing windows at varying heights and angles. The addition of a roof terrace in this location is not considered to result in significantly greater levels of overlooking to the detriment of adjacent neighbours.

4.3 As such, the proposed development is acceptable in amenity terms, notwithstanding the design and heritage objections previously noted.

4. Recommendation

5.1 Refuse planning permission