

FULL STATEMENT OF CASE

CASE NO. 2018/2673/P

TOP FLOOR FLAT, 21 GLENMORE ROAD, LONDON, NW3 4BY

4TH OF OCTOBER 2018

APPLICANT: ZOE SCOTT

Contents

Introduction	3
The Proposed Development.....	3
The Main Objective.....	3
Planning Process	4
Pre-application Advice.....	4
Historical Planning Applications	4
Planning Application	4
Refusal of the Application.....	5
Consultee Comments for Planning Application	5
Public Comments	6
The Argument	6
Design and appearance	6
Acceptable Conditions	13
Annex A.....	14

Introduction

The subject site is an Edwardian terraced house that is split across the 1st floor and attic storey within a slate-faced mansard. The property itself is the mid of terrace dwelling set amongst similar properties on the Glenmore Road. The property is situated within the Belsize Conservation Area located near the junction with Glenloch Road.

The houses along Glenmore Road are two storey red brick terraces with a basement and an attic storey. At roof level the party walls are expressed as upstands with shared chimneys located at the ridge that step up the street. All the houses have three light, two storey bays and dormers and utilise render and white painted timber frames to provide contrast. The upper portions of windows are sub-divided by glazing bars.

The Proposed Development

The proposal is rear dormer loft conversion together with the installation of 4 no. roof lights to the front elevation in line with the 1st floor fenestration. Overall upgrade of the existing attic area is not a major scale and does not require any disruption of the adjoining properties and the public roads and pathways.

The Main Objective

It is important to understand that our overall goal is to improve the quality of the existing property on this site by:

- 1) Extending the mass on site, whilst not affecting light and space around adjacent properties
- 2) Building new form through careful architectural detailing, whilst remaining authentic by using the finish materials to match original
- 3) Improving the private inside spaces and thus the quality of the internal layout

Planning Process

10th of June 2018 the Full Planning Permission application was submitted to the Local Authority by an acting agent.

16th of July 2018 the case officer Obote Hope responded to the emails regarding the validation of application. There was advice that submitted proposal would be contrary to D1 and D2 of the Local Plan 2017.

13th of August 2018 the applicant provided a cover letter for the proposal. The letter contained already approved precedents in the area.

10th of September 2018 the Full Planning Permission was refused by the Development Management at London Borough of Camden. The case manager was Obote Hope.

Pre-application Advice

No pre-application advice was sought.

Historical Planning Applications

2016/1329/P - Conversion of single-family dwelling house into 2 x 2 bedroom self-contained flats. Granted Subject to 106 Legal Agreement on 18/11/2016.

Planning Application

Planning application was submitted following the approval of similar developments in the area most recently Flat D, 31 Glenmore Road on 30th April 2018 (2018/0769/P).

For the full details on Full Planning Application please see enclosed form and drawings.

Refusal of the Application

Key points for the refusal of an application:

- The proposed rear dormer by reason of its bulk, scale and siting on a largely unobstructed roofscape at upper level would be an incongruous addition to the host property and detract from the character and appearance of the building, wider terrace and Belsize Conservation Area, contrary to policy D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

Please see enclosed documents of Delegated Report and the REFUSAL NOTICE from the Development Management.

Consultee Comments for Planning Application

Consultee Details

Name: Sanya Polescuk for Belsize Residents Association

Date: 05/08/2018

The Association commented that the proposed development should not be acceptable.

Comment below:

The proposed dormer does not comply with current Planning Guidelines for new dormers, distance from the main house roof ridge and eaves.

Consultee Details

Name: Eldred Evans, Chair of Conservation Area Advisory Committee

The committee commented that the proposed development should not be acceptable.

Comment below:

Object to design and bulk of rear dormer window. Object to 4 number front roof lights.

Public Comments

No public comments.

The Argument

Please see the relevant policies to the proposed application.

Design and appearance

- 1. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. The Local Plan 2017 (paragraph 7.2) aims to ensure the all developments, including alterations and extensions, respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties as well as the character and proportions of the existing building where alterations are made. The proposal would be a departure from these design principles of the Local Plan 2017 due to the bulk, scale and setting of the proposed dormer.*

Response:

The application was mainly considered from the design perspective view. The appearance of the proposed dormer can be altered by proposing more detailed drawings for the external elevations. However, the materials to be used would match the existing and the windows would match the fenestration below.

The case officer did not consider that the proposed dormer and the front roof lights would harm the amenity of neighbouring residents in terms of privacy, overlooking, outlook and daylight/sunlight.

- 2. The Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1: Design) states that dormer extension should be subordinate and appear as small projection on the roof surface. Moreover, the SPG document states that dormer extensions should not be*

introduced to shallow-pitched roofs. The design guidance stipulates 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.

Response:

There is a group of four existing dormers, surrounded on either side by the dormers at numbers 31, 33, 35D and 19C. These dormers were approved for the same style and shape of the roof. The Camden Planning Guidance was in place before these dormers were approved.

- 3. Furthermore, by virtue of the site being located within the Belsize Conservation Area, the Council has a statutory duty, under section 72 (Conservation Areas) of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. This is reflected in policy D2 (Heritage) which seeks to only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area.*

Response:

The proposed dormer would be finished to match the existing materials. Walls of the dormer to be finished in lead and windows would be conservation type timber framed sash. Junctions between walls and roof would be finished in lead. The roof of the dormer would slope to the rear and drain into a hidden gutter which discharges to the sides. Front elevation roof lights would also be conservation type and would not protrude from the roof plane.

- 4. The Belsize conservation area statement identifies the inappropriate roof extension that threatens the character and appearance of the conservation area. The property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely, but not completely, unimpaired; the property currently forms part of a symmetrical composition with its neighbour at no.23, the balance of which would be upset. It should be noted that, the proposed dormer would not result in symmetry with*

no.19, as it is a large dormer with terrace. Therefore, it would not be sympathetic to its neighbour rather appear as additional dormer that would undermine the integrity of the roof slope and diminish the architectural quality of the host building and wider terrace.

Response:

The creation of symmetrical composition with no. 19 would also allow the symmetrical and fair house extension for no. 21. The proposed dormer was designed to match the size and mirror the position of the neighbouring dormer at 19C. Architectural quality would be maintained by using the matching materials and features such as windows.

5. *There are 32 properties within the wider building group and six of these properties consist of double dormer extensions. It is therefore considered that the roofscape is generally unobstructed at this level. Of these 6 dormers, 2 are historic (no's 33 and 63) and were granted planning permission or carried out under permitted development rights prior to the designation of the Belsize Conservation Area. The rear dormer at upper level at no. 27 Glenmore Road is acknowledged to be a subordinate addition granted under previous design guidance.*

Response:

Four of these rear dormers are situated between numbers 19 and 35 Glenmore Road (at numbers 31, 33, 35D and 19C). In addition, there are two dormers almost opposite to the rear on Howitt Road. The dormer at Flat D, 31 Glenmore Road, was granted planning permission on 30th April 2018 (2018/0769/P), one month before submission of the planning application 2018/2673/P; flat 35 was granted planning permission on 26th January 2016 (2015/6326/P) and 19C immediately next door to the property on 18th October 2013 (2012/6777/P).

Figure: Location of proposed and existing dormers in surrounding houses



6. There is also a grouping of dormers at upper slope level at no's 31, 33 and 35. The reasons for granting for no's 31 and 35 make reference to the symmetry that the proposal would result in with the dormer at no.33 and clearly state that it is only acceptable in this context. The officer's report for planning permission ref. 2015/6326/P states, 'The proposed second floor rear dormer has been designed to match the dormer at the neighbouring property at 33 Glenmore Road (2007/1625/P). It is considered that the proposed dormer is only acceptable in this instance given the existence of the dormer at 33 and the symmetry that would result between these attached properties which would form a balanced pair within the terrace at second floor level'.

Response:

This would be an identical situation to the pairing at no. 33 and no. 31, where the dormer at no. 21 would be a balanced pair with the dormer at no. 19, No. 35 and no. 31 were 2 dormers both approved following an existing dormer which was not built in accordance to the Camden Planning Guidance.

7. This grouping of dormers are of a smaller scale than dormer proposed at the application site and are a more subordinate addition to the roof slope that better

maintain the roof form. Officers consider that the construction of upper slope dormers, which is more established form further down the street, should not be able to 'creep' further northwards. The upper dormer at adjoining property no. 19 Glenmore Road (ref. 2012/6777/P) was refused and subsequently allowed on appeal. Whilst the planning inspector stated that no.19 would preserve the area's character, the Council does not consider this a sympathetic addition that maintains the integrity of the roofscape and therefore is not considered precedent. The proposed dormer varies in its form and detailed design to no.19 and would not achieve symmetry; this was the case with the smaller dormer additions at no's 31 and 35.

Response:

The mass, scale and bulk of the proposed dormer has been designed to be similar to the existing dormer at 19C to achieve as much symmetry as possible. Indeed, the Planning Inspector stated that number 19 (2012/6777/P) would preserve the area's character. It is a very clear precedent approved by the appeal inspector. Therefore, the decision to submit the planning application for the dormer loft conversion at the adjoining property was made. The dormer at 19C was not considered a historical planning application where different planning policies would have been applied.

As Camden's policy regarding the construction of dormers in conservation areas has not been amended, it is believed that simply stating that '*Officers consider that the construction of upper slope dormers, which is more established form further down the street, should not be able to 'creep' further northwards*' is neither a valid or fair reason for rejecting a dormer on the same street when considered under the same guidelines. Moreover, there is already a dormer further north than Top Flat no. 21, at no. 19C.

Additionally, the 500 mm distance from roof ridge as per CPG guidance was permitted to be broken at numbers 19C, 31, and 35.

8. *The NPPF 2018 is explicit in the way that local planning authorities could consider applications in the designated conservation areas which requires local planning authorities to ensure that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated*

heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or from development within its setting), should require clear and convincing justification. There is no convincing justification in this instance as the dormer would serve a bathroom and not facilitate the creation of any additional units. There is therefore no identified public benefit to outweigh the harm.

Response:

The internal layout of the loft conversion would create both an additional bedroom and a second toilet and bathroom. A loft conversion without dormer would provide only an additional bedroom, with head clearance limited to a 2m width. It is unclear how internal layout would affect the planning permission when the main concern is the appearance of the dormer.

9. *In terms of detailed design, CPG (design) requires dormer extension to be designed so they should generally be aligned with windows on the lower floors, appear as small projections and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows below. The proposed dormer extension would occupy the full depth of the roof slope, measuring approximately 4.2m in depth, 2.5m in width and 2.5m in height. The proposed roof extension would be a bulky and incongruous addition on this section of Glenmore Road that would dominate the roof slope. The rear gardens are shallow and prevent views of this part of the roof; however, the dormer would be visible from 'above ground' windows of some properties located to the rear on Howitt Road. In these views, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the host building, the wider terrace and this part of the Belsize Conservation Area.*

Response:

The dormer is not visible in public views due to its rear location and mid-terrace position. The only private spaces from which the dormer will be visible are the "above ground" windows on Howitt Road opposite. This view is already altered by existing dormers at nos. 31, 33, 35 and in particular 19C with which the proposed dormer will provide symmetry. In addition, the view from the top flat no. 21 is affected by several dormers of various sizes at nos. 32 and 34 Howitt Road.

10. *The installation of the four roof lights to the front elevation would not be considered harmful to the integrity of the roof form and due to the shallow pitch of the upper roof slope, are unlikely to be visible in public or private views. Furthermore, several other properties along this side of Glenmore Road have a comparable number of rooflights. As such, this element of the proposal is not considered harmful to the character and appearance of buildings and the wider conservation area.*

Response:

Considered as an approved part of the application.

Amenity

1. *The Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenities of existing and future occupiers are not unduly impacted by development in terms of privacy, outlook, sense of enclosure, loss of daylight/sunlight, noise and vibration.*
2. *The roof extension is not considered harmful to the amenity of adjoining occupiers in terms of loss of light or outlook given its setting at upper roof level away from neighbouring windows. The installation of new windows and roof lights would not exacerbate levels of overlooking. As such, the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would comply with policy A1 of the Local Plan 2017.*

Response:

We agree with the case officer's statement that roof extension and front elevation roof windows are not harmful to the amenity of adjoining occupiers. No public complaints were received meaning that the neighbours do consider the proposal to be acceptable.

Acceptable Conditions

The acceptable conditions would be:

- Smaller scale of the windows
- Smaller scale of the dormer

Annex A

Precedents:

19C Glenmore Road: 2012/6777/P

Flat D 31 Glenmore Road: 2018/0769/P

33 Glenmore Road: 2007/1625/P

35 Glenmore Road: 2015/6326/P

32 Howitt Road: 8702987

34 Howitt Road: 8601867