

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		06/12/2018	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		09/12/2018	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Obote Hope				2018/4898/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
4 Savernake Road London NW3 2JN				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>							
Loft conversion including installation of a dormer and rooflight on the rear roofslope and two rooflights on the front roofslope.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	00	No. of responses No. electronic	02 02	No. of objections	02
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Site Notice 09/11/2018 – 03/12/2018. Press Notice: 15/11/2018 – 09/12/2018.  Objection from neighbouring owner/occupier: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Documents are not available to download</li> </ul>					
<b>Belsize CAAC:</b>		Objection from the Mansfield Conservation Area Advisory Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size of the proposed new rear dormer is far too large and despite any examples pre-dating the CA any further additional such developments would serve as cumulative harm.</li> </ul>					

### Site Description

- The application site is located on the north side of Savernake Road east of Lisburne Road and almost at the point where the road follows westwards into Constantine Road. It is located within the Mansfield Conservation Area. The site comprises a three storey semi-detached property divided into flats. The host building, as with all others in this street, is considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
- According to the Mansfield Conservation Area Statement, the houses along Savernake Road are flat fronted with a projecting bay window over two storeys, recessed paired entrance doors, visible pitched roofs and prominent chimneystacks and party walls, and original two or three storey part-width

rear extensions. The quality and variety of materials and level of detailing applied to each terrace gives an indication of its original status within the hierarchy of the estate. Moreover, no. 4 reads as a pair with no.2; despite their setting in the road, with a break in terms of frontage and building line from neighbouring properties to the west and east, the elevations of both properties give strong rhythm and consistency to the other properties.

## Relevant History

N/A

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2018

### London Plan 2016

### Camden Local Plan 2017

G1 Delivery and location of growth

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design para 7.2

D2 Heritage para 7.41

### Camden Planning (2018)

CPG1 Design (July 2015 updated March 2018) Sections 1, 2, 3, 4, & 5

CPG3 Sustainability (July 2015 updated March 2018) Sections 1 & 4

CPG6 Amenity

### Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2008 (Page 16, 28 and 29)

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 The proposal is detailed as follows:

- Erection of a rear dormer on roof slope measuring approximately 3.5m (W) x 1.8m (H) x 2.9m (D).
- 2 rooflights to front roofslope and 1 rooflight at rear.

### 2.0 Principle

2.1 The dormer roof extension proposed is considered to be unacceptable in principle and detail.

### 3.0 Design and Appearance

3.1 The proposed dormer roof extension would be contrary to design principles contained within Local Plan 2017 policy D1 (*paragraph 7.2*). This specifies that extensions should be designed to the highest standard and new developments are required to consider the character, setting, proportion, context, form and scale of the existing building where alterations are proposed. Camden Planning Guidance 1 on Design (*paragraph 5.8*) supports this policy requirement and states that a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse affect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene- in particular, it refers to the criteria of 'Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design'. CPG in para 5.11 stipulates that roof dormers should maintain the overall structure of the existing roof form, be designed with a minimum setback of 0.5m from the roof eaves, ridge and slope and the dormer window should relate to the façade treatment below. Moreover,

dormer roof extensions should appear as separate small projections on the roof surface and aligned with windows on the lower floors and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows below.

3.2 In this case, the proposed dormer would be a departure from these design principles due to the height, width, overall scale and setting within an unaltered roof slope to the rear of the properties within the terrace. Thus, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and its semi-detached neighbour.

3.3 The Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (CAAMS) stipulates that minor alterations and extensions to existing dwellings can have a cumulative impact on elements that contribute to the character and appearance of buildings, streets and areas as a whole. The most noticeable changes within the area often result from roof extensions - particularly where the conservation area retains its clearly visible historic rooflines, which it is important to preserve. Fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape.

3.4 The CAAMS states that roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable where a building forms part of a complete terrace or group of buildings which have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions or where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition. It makes reference to specified streets which include Constantine Road, described as 'Largely unaltered', and Savernake Road, described as having 'Terrace rows of largely unaltered roofscape'. Although there are several other rear dormers along both these roads, many are old and predate this guidance (eg. nos 14, 16, 22 and 24 date from 1988, 1979, 1987 and 1998 respectively) and overall they do not result in a largely altered roofscape. Moreover the pair of buildings here stand physically proud of their neighbours on either side and have an unaltered roofscape themselves. Thus it is considered that the dormer proposed is unacceptable in principle. It should also be noted that the rear elevation of this property is not only visible from the rear gardens within the conservation area but also from the railway line and Hampstead Heath behind, as well as the adjoining public footpath to its side, thus the proposed dormer will be widely visible from many viewpoints.

3.5 Also the dormer is considered unacceptable in design detail. The roof extension would sit relatively flush with the roof ridge and not set down 500mm below the ridge as required by CPG Design para 5.11. Its 3.5m width seems excessive and appears awkward in its design. The dormer would not be subordinate to the roof and the proposed windows bear no relationship with the windows below, where the expectation is for windows to be reduced in terms of hierarchy as you move up the building. The proposed use of non-traditional materials (UPVC) is unacceptable for a traditional property of this architectural age and timber framed windows would be more suitable. As such, the proposed dormer extension would be unsympathetic in its design and appearance.

3.6 Paragraph 64 of the NPPF states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area. In this case, the proposal is considered to be of a poor design that detracts from architectural quality and would erode the character of the host building and conservation area. Consequently, the proposal is considered to create additional harmful mass and bulk to the rear roofslope.

3.7 The proposal would be of a scale and design that would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the wider area. The proposal would therefore conflict with Policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017. Moreover, the proposal would also be contrary to Mansfield Conservation Area Appraisal, which requires development to be of a high quality design as well as being in character and proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties. Thus it would harm the historic character and appearance of the wider Mansfield Conservation Area.

3.8 The proposal is not considered to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation

Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.

3.9 The proposed two rooflights to the front and one rooflight to the rear elevation would be acceptable in design and appearance as they would be relatively small and appropriately positioned.

#### **4.0 Amenity**

4.1 The Local Plan policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenities of existing and future occupiers are not unduly impacted upon. New development should not have a detrimental impact in terms of privacy, outlook, daylight/sunlight, light spill and noise. It is considered that the proposed dormer extension that overlooks the existing railway line would be acceptable in this regard.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

5.1 In view of the assessment above, the proposed development is considered to be contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Local Plan 2017.

**6.0 Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission