Delegated Re		port A	Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	19/07/2018	
		Ν	N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	28/06/2018	
Officer				Application Nu	umber(s)		
Stuart Clapha	m			2018/1786/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
4 Frognal Close							
London NW3 6YB				See Decision Notice			
PO 3/4	Area Tea	m Signature	C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Signature		
Proposal(s)							
Erection of part 1, part 2 storey side and rear extension. Use of roof of ground floor rear extension as a roof terrace and erection of balustrade.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse householder application					
Application Type:		Householder Application					

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	_ Refer to Draft Decision Notice						
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses 02 No. of object	tions 02					
Summary of consultation responses:	 e occupiers of No. 2 and No. 3 Frognal Close object on the following punds: 1. Use of ground floor extension as roof terrace would overlook No. 3 Frognal Close and have an unacceptable impact on privacy. 2. The house is of historic significance 3. The house already has a large rear garden and therefore the roof terrace is unnecessary 4. There is no example of glass balustrading in the close 5. The increased perception of bulk ficer response 1. See Assessment point 3.2 2. See site description 3. While it is noted that the property already has outdoor amenity space, this would not be a significant consideration for development of this scale. 4. See Assessment point 2.1 5. See Assessment point 2.2 						
The Heath and Hampstead Society	 The Heath and Hampstead Society has objected to the application on the grounds that The proposal would damage the concept, size, scale and detail of this locally listed building The large expanses of uninterrupted glazing are out of character with the existing designs of houses in the group Officer response See assessment points 2.1-2.3. Please note that this application only reviews the roof terrace aspect of the proposal on the basis that the remainder of the scheme was previously consented under current planning policy and guidance. In the interests of clarity, it is noted that the building is not locally listed. 						

Site Description

The site is a two-storey semi-detached house on Frognal Close. The property is located within the Reddington Frognal Conservation Area, to which it is noted as a positive contributor in the Conservation Area Statement. The house erected in 1937 and was built by Ernest Freud as a close of six houses, four of which are Grade II listed.

The rear elevation of the property is set forward approximately 3m from its semi-detached pair along. At ground floor level the rear elevation is dominated by three large windows, with three windows at the first floor placed within a set-forward brick design detail. Beyond the rear elevation are three 3m-tall brick pillars, pertaining to a previous covered walkway which is now extensively damaged. Beyond these pillars is a large garden area, with foliage (including mature trees) largely obscuring views to neighbouring properties to the north and west (although not to the south).

Relevant History Application site

2017/5271/P. 4 Frognal Close Erection of a part two storey and part single storey side extension following the demolition of an existing single storey side extension. The replacement of all existing (non original) painted timber windows and pvc windows with slim profile metal double glazed casement windows. **Granted subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 14/02/2018**

Note: Roof terrace component removed following officer feedback

2017/2141/P. Erection of a single storey extension and alteration of first floor rear window fenestration to the rear elevation and installation of roof light and solar panels to the main roof of the dwellinghouse and roof light to the front extension (C3). **Certificate of Lawful Development issued 25/04/2018**

2016/1516/P. Erection of a single storey rear extension to the dwellinghouse (C3). **Certificate of Lawfulness issued 22/03/2016**

2015/5953/P. Removal of the existing single storey side extension and erection of a part two storey and part single storey side extension with a single storey extension to the rear of the property. The replacement of all existing (non-original) painted timber windows and pvc windows with slim profile metal double glazed casement windows. Householder planning permission Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 16/02/2016

2010/0898/P. Additions and alterations including the erection of a part single storey, part two storey side and rear extension, excavation of a basement to create additional living space, gym and internal swimming pool, a lightwell to the front and replacement of windows. **Householder planning permission refused 30/04/2010**

Neighbouring properties

2013/4757/L. 1 Frognal Close. Installation of roof light to ground floor terrace of single dwelling house (Class C3). Listed Building Consent Granted 20/09/2013

2010/6391/L. 1 Frognal Close. Internal alterations including alterations to room layouts, refurbishment and extensions to an existing basement rooflight to single dwelling (Class C3). **Listed Building Consent granted 21/01/2011.**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2016

London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017

Policies

D1 (Design) D2 (Heritage) A1 (Managing the impact of development)

Supplementary planning guidance

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) CPG 1 Design (July 2015 updated March 2018) CPG Amenity (March 2018)

Reddington Frognal Conservation Area Statement (January 2003)

Assessment

Background

- 1.1 The application seeks consent for the erection of a side and rear extension, and for the use of the roof of the rear extension as a roof terrace, to include rear glazed balustrade and obscure-glazed privacy screen to the southern elevation. Planning consent already exists for the rear and side extension under 2017/5271/P of 14/02/2018. This application therefore only assesses the acceptability of the roof terrace element.
- 1.2The roof terrace would measure 2.7m x 14m at first floor level, and would be accessed through previously-consented rear doors to the first floor bedrooms. Glass balustrading would rise 0.9m above the proposed parapet wall to the ground floor rear extension. To the southern elevation, a 1.8m high, 2.4m-wide obscure glass privacy screen would be erected.
- 1.3The relevant planning considerations for the roof terrace aspects are: design and heritage; and amenity.

Design and heritage

- 2.1 The balustrade would run the full width of the property and be prominent on the rear elevation by nature of its placement at first floor level on a principal election. Other buildings on the close incorporate roof terraces, including which are visible from the street. These are, however, enclosed using the dark brick which matches the host building and discrete metal railings rather than the glass balustrade proposed here.
- 2.2 While noting that the consented extension and first floor fenestration changes would lead to an increase glazing component to the rear elevation, the property would still retain the integrity of its original fenestration alignment, dark brick materiality and clear view of the raised brick design of the first floor rear elevation.
- 2.3 The introduction of fully glazed balustrades would appear as a modern addition which is incongruous with the distinct architectural style and period of the host building. Through the width of the glazing (across full rear elevation of the building) and height (which covers the part of architectural features of the rear façade), it would harm the integrity and proportions of the host building, particularly the prominence and weight of the first floor brick detailing.
- 2.4 The privacy screen would also be a prominent alien modern structure within the rear garden

scape, which is characterised by dark brick and natural green space. It would be prominent in private views from the rear gardens and some rear windows at No. 3 Frognal Close, and increase the appearance of bulk of the rear extension.

- 2.5 Considerable importance and weight has been attached to the harm and special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013
- 2.6 As such, the proposed roof terrace would cause less than significant harm to the character and appearance of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area without providing and demonstrable public benefit.

Amenity

- 3.1 The proposed roof terrace would result in new outlook to the north, south and west of the property. No harm would result from the northern and western outlooks on account of the screening provided by the mature trees and the length of the gardens.
- 3.2 The proposed privacy screen would prevent harmful levels of overlooking to the rear elevation and inner garden of No. 3. While some overlooking would remain to the outer garden areas of No. 3, this would be less sensitive and not considered harmful.
- 3.3No other aspect of the proposed scheme would be considered to result in harmful levels of overshadowing, noise or artificial light pollution.
- 3.4 Notwithstanding the unacceptability of the privacy screen in design terms, the proposal would be considered acceptable under Local Plan Policy A1.

Recommendation

- 4.1 Refuse planning permission
- 4.2 The proposed roof balustrade and privacy screening, by reason of its scale, siting and proposed materials, would appear as an incongruous alien structure which harms the architectural integrity of the host building and results in excessive perceptions of bulk. The proposal would also result in harm to the character and appearance of the Redington Frognal Conservation Area. The scheme would therefore be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.