

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>27/12/2018</b>
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>09/12/2018</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Numbers</b>	
Samir Benmbarek			2018/5291/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
35 Hillway London N6 6AH			Please refer to draft 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>				
Variation of condition 3 (approved drawings) of planning permission ref: 2018/3223/P dated 17/10/2018 for the erection of front porch; single storey side extension and rear extension; formation of rear terrace at first floor level and installation of solar panels and 3x rooflights to dwellinghouse following demolition of existing front porch and garage; namely reduction in the depth and width of rear extension; hip to part gable extension and erection of 1x side dormer window				
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>			No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Two site notices were displayed in close proximity to the application site from 14/11/2018 (expiring on 08/12/2018). A press notice was also displayed from 15/11/2018 (expiring on 09/12/2018).</p> <p>To date, one response has been received from the following addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 33 Hillway</li> </ul> <p>The comments are summarised as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcome omission of the south facing dormer</li> <li>2. Welcome the reduction in the rear extension; however its scale should be further reduced to reduce the concerns of the rear structure being overbearing</li> <li>3. Concerns of the previously approved rear first floor terrace;</li> <li>4. No concerns on the north facing dormer.</li> </ol>					
<b>CAAC comments:</b>	<p>The Holly Lodge Estate CAAC were formally consulted. Their comments are as summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Welcomes the reduction of the rear extension; however, it's scale should be further reduced to gain further space for maintenance access;</li> <li>2. Doors in the extension have been amended which is acceptable;</li> <li>3. Concerns of the first floor rear terrace remaining in the scheme; should be amended to reduce concerns of overlooking;</li> <li>4. The hip to part gable extension should be refused as there is no precedent for such;</li> <li>5. The north facing dormer should be reduced in length</li> </ol>					

## Site Description

The application refers to a two-storey detached dwelling house located on the eastern side of Hillway. The building is located within the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area and is described as a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. It is not a listed building. The building is also located within the geographical area covered by the Highgate Neighbourhood Forum. The building (as well as the conservation area as a whole) is influenced by the Arts and Crafts tradition.

The topography of the vicinity is sloping with the neighbouring sites being at different ground levels than the subject site. No 33 has a ground level that is 1.9m beneath that of the application site while the ground level of No. 37 is 1.2m higher than the application site.

## Relevant History

### No. 35 Hillway (Application Site):

**Ref: 2018/3223/P-** Erection of front porch; single storey side extension and rear extension; formation of rear terrace at first floor level and installation of solar panels and 3x rooflights to dwellinghouse following demolition of existing front porch and garage.

**Granted 17/10/2018.**

### No. 33 Hillway:

No planning application history

### No. 37 Hillway:

No planning application history.

## Relevant policies

### **National Planning Policy Framework, 2018**

### **The London Plan 2016**

### **Camden Local Plan 2017**

A1 (Managing the impact of development)

D1 (Design)

D2 (Heritage)

### **Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance**

CGP1 (Design) (Updated March 2018)

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011

### **Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2012**

### **Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017**

DH2 (Development proposal in Highgate's Conservation Areas)

DH3 (Rear Extensions)

DH5 (Roofs and roofscape)

### 1. Proposal

1.1 Permission is sought to vary condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission ref: 2018/3223/P dated 17/10/2018. The amendments to the previously consented scheme include:

- Erection of a hip to part gable roof extension;
- Erection of 1x side dormer window on north facing roof slope
- Reduction in the width and depth of the approved rear extension with associated alterations (introduction of 0.3m setback from the boundary with No. 33 and reduction in depth of 1.5m from the rear).

### 2. Assessment

2.1 The main issues for consideration are:

- Design and conservation;
- Neighbour amenity

### 3. Design

#### Roof alterations

3.1 The application property (No. 35 Hillway) is a two-storey detached dwelling house located on the western side of Hillway. The roof form of the building is hipped along with the rest of the row of buildings in which the dwelling house forms a part of (Nos 33- 47 Hillway). Aside from No. 33 Hillway, which features a gable end roof and a dormer on its north facing roof slope, there are no roof extensions or dormers to the neighbouring properties. No 33 is a corner property and it is considered that its design (particularly at roof level) mirrors that of No. 28 Hillway opposite. Both No. 33 and No. 28 are more prominent corner properties which 'bookend' the blocks by the junction of Hillway and Langbourne Avenue.

3.2 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all development. The following considerations contained within policy D1 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of the neighbouring building, and the quality of materials to be used. Within areas of distinctive character or adjacent to one, it is considered development should reinforce those elements which contribute to and create the character, in line with policy D2.

3.3 CPG1 (Design) advises that a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable where there are complete terraces or large groups of buildings that have a roofline that are largely unimpaired by extensions or alterations.

3.4 The Holly Lodge Estate Appraisal and Management Strategy (HLEAMS), states that overlarge or inappropriately detailed dormers and roof extensions are a key issue for the conservation area (p.34). It goes on further to read "***Dormers and roof extensions that distort the shape and articulation of the arts and crafts design of gables are eroding the roofscape. Insensitive designs or overscaled extensions are not appropriate. Dormers and roofs are in groups or families of designs***".

3.5 Within this preceding context the proposals in principle would erode the largely unimpaired

character amongst the row of building by introducing these additions at roof level which are alien to the row of buildings. It is acknowledged there is a north facing dormer at No. 33 Hillway; however, this is a slightly different building type and there are no planning records for the dormer extension.

- 3.6 It is further observed that there are dormer windows along Hillway; however, these are on different rows of dwelling houses. CPG1 (Design) advises on roof developments on a row-by-row basis. In regards to the row of dwelling houses of which No. 35 forms part, although the overall appearance of the houses (particular at front elevation) have slight variations from each other, the roof appearance and form are consistent along this row.
- 3.7 The scale and positioning of the proposed dormer is considered unacceptable. Although set down from the roof ridge by 0.5m, it is set up from the eaves by 0.2m. CPG1 stipulates this should be a minimum of 0.5m. The scale and width of the side dormer is considered unduly large for its purpose, which is to accommodate a staircase into the roof level.
- 3.8 As well as the proposed dormer introducing an alien feature upon a largely unimpaired row of buildings; the proposed hip to part gable roof extension is also considered out of character and would cause harm to the unaltered appearance of this group of properties, contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan.

#### Alterations to rear extension

- 3.9 The reduction in the width and depth of the previously approved rear extension is considered acceptable. The design and materials would remain the same as previously approved, and the reduction in massing would be a minor change which would further ensure the extension remained subordinate to the existing dwelling.
- 3.10 The rear doors of the extension have also been altered to be more sympathetic to the appearance of the building and conservation area, which is welcomed by the Council.

#### Other alterations

- 3.11 The proposed plans also indicate the replacement of windows throughout the property. The proposed framing for the windows would be timber and the windows would be of a matching appearance and glazing bar arrangement as the existing. Although considered acceptable in principle, should the amended scheme be approved, a condition would have been attached to secure further details on the replacement windows.

### **4. Amenity**

- 4.1 Within the Camden Local Plan, policy A1 seeks to ensure that development does not cause adverse amenity impacts upon neighbours in terms of sunlight, daylight, privacy, overlooking, noise, vibration and odour.
- 4.2 The site is neighboured by residential dwelling houses that need to be taken into regard when assessing impacts of amenity. In particular, the neighbouring building No. 33 Hillway, which is at a lower ground level than the host building (1.9m less).
- 4.3 It is considered that the hip-to-gable roof extension and side dormer would not cause undue harm upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers by virtue of its position upon the roof. Due to the topography of the site and no windows on the flank wall of No. 37 Hillway, the proposed dormer would not result in overlooking into neighbouring properties. However, this does not overcome the concerns on design of the roof extensions.
- 4.4 As within the previously consented scheme (2018/3223/P) it was considered that the proposed rear extension would not adversely impact on the adjoining occupiers at No. 33 Hillway, it is considered that the reduction in the mass of the extension would also not be of an adverse

impact.

4.5 The alterations to the windows would not impact on neighbouring amenity.

## **5. Recommendation**

Refuse planning permission.