

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	12/08/2019
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	08/09/2019
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Josh Lawlor			2019/3108/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
Flat 2nd Floor 9 Thurlow Road London NW3 5PJ			See decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Installation of front, side and rear dormer windows.				
Recommendation(s):	Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed outside the site on Thurlow road from the 09/08/2019 – 02/09/2019</p> <p>A press notice was advertised between 15/08/2019 - 08/09/2019</p> <p>One objection was received from a neighbouring occupier on Thurlow road. The objection can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current application is a repeated version of application 2018/6386/P which the council rightly rejected on the grounds that it destroyed the symmetry with the other half of the semi-detached house, number 10, and as such was contrary to the Conservation Area Statement for Fitzjohns/Netherhall. The proposed dormers will be detrimental to the special character of the conservation area. • In crude vernacular, if the proposed additions were approved, the symmetry of the combined building would be destroyed and would irreversibly damage the special features of a fine early Victorian house which is protected under Camden's detailed guidelines. • While undoubtedly, several roofs in the street have been blighted by unfortunate approvals given during the 1970's, in recent years Camden council has been far more diligent to protect the remaining symmetry of this distinctive road. The proposed scheme would reignite past vandalism of the road's appearance, and I would therefore urge the council to reject the latest application. • The application suggests that the proposed dormers match existing dormers of the 'neighbours'. That is untrue regarding the matching semi-detached house, 10 Thurlow Road. 					
Local Amenity and Conservation Groups	<p>A letter was sent out to the Fitzjohns and Netherhall Conservation Area Advisory Committee on the 06/08/2019</p> <p>No comment was received</p> <p>A letter was sent out to the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum on the 06/08/2019</p> <p>The Hampstead Neighbourhood forum raised the following objection:</p>					

- This property is a semi-detached, contrary to some other houses on the street, no. 10 has no front or rear dormer and the two properties form a coherent pair, presenting a symmetrical façade and roof line to the street. Inserting dormers to no. 9 would unbalance this symmetry and would be contrary to DH1, which states that development proposals should respect and enhance the character and context of the local area
- The conservation statement cites dormers as an issue in the area: ‘a feature of architecture in the mid to late Victorian period is the visibility of the roof. Insensitive alterations can harm the character of the roofspace with poor materials, intrusive dormers, and inappropriate windows and in many cases there is no further possibility of alterations’

The Heath and Hampstead Society objected to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The partner ‘semi’ on the west side has a roof room with only one dormer at the rear, therefore the front and side dormers will unbalance the building which is a classical style which therefore requires symmetry

Officer response: Please see design and heritage, section of this report.

Site Description

The host property relates to a three storey with lower ground floor semi-detached building located on the northern side of Thurlow road. The building is in use as three self-contained flats with the application site relating to the second floor flat. The building is located within the Fitzjohns and Netherhall Conservation Area and is identified as making a positive contribution the character and appearance of the Conservation area. The site is also located within the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan area.

Relevant History

Relevant Planning History:

2018/6386/P Erection of rear dormer and installation of 2x front and 2x side rooflights to second floor flat (Use C3) Granted 16/04/2019

Officer comment: The original submission was for front, side and rear dormers. Officers advised that a front and side dormer were unacceptable as they would unbalance the symmetry of this semi-detached building. The granted planning application was the outcome of revisions to the original submission which included the removal of the front and side dormers.

2019/3093/P Erection of single storey rear outbuilding – Registered

2019/2811/P Erection of single storey rear extension with roof terrace and associated access doors, two storey side extension, demolition of existing side extension – Registered

Relevant policies

The National Planning Policy Framework 2019

London Plan 2016, consolidated with alterations since 2011

Camden local Plan 2017

- Policy D1 Design
- Policy D2 Heritage
- Policy A1 Managing the Impact of Development

Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018

- Policy DH1 Design
- Policy DH2 Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)

- CPG Design (July 2015 Updated March 2019)
- CPG Altering and Extending your Home (March 2019)
- CPG Amenity (March 2018)

The Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area statement (March 2001)

1. Proposal

1.1 The proposed front, rear and side dormer windows would have a height of 1.7m and width of 2m. The dormers would retain a 500mm separation between the roof ridge and eaves. The dormers would use traditional materials, with timber framed double glazed windows. The dormers would have a lead finish.

2. Assessment

2.1 The material consideration in the determination of this application relates to the impact of the proposed dormers on the character and appearance of the host building, and the wider Fitzjohns/Netherhall Conservation Area.

3. Design and Heritage

Front and side dormers

- 3.1. CPG *Altering and Extending your Home* states that a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the appearance of the building. The guidance goes on to specify that '*a roof extension would be unacceptable for buildings with shallow pitched roofs with eaves*'. The application building has a shallow pitched roof and it is considered that the proposed front and side dormers would dominate the roof and appear as an overly bulky addition.
- 3.2. The guidance document also states that roof extensions would be considered unacceptable when '*buildings designed as a complete composition would have its architectural style undermined*'. This pair of semi-detached buildings (nos. 9 - 10) currently has no front or side dormer windows, therefore the introduction of front and side dormers to no. 9 would unbalance the symmetry of building and undermine its architectural style and proportions. It is also noted that the front and side dormers would be immediately visible in from the public realm.
- 3.3. The design and access statement submitted with the application seeks to justify the introduction of front and side dormers through referencing buildings with front and side dormers elsewhere on Thurlow Road. It is noted that the neighbouring semi-detached buildings (nos. 7 and 8) have front and side dormers however these dormers dominate the roofslope and are not regarded as justification for a similar form of development. It is noted that the front and side dormers at no. 8 Thurlow Road were granted over 14 years ago under a different development plan and guidance (ref. 2005/0144/P dated 25/02/2005) and are not considered appropriate justification for further development of this kind. It is also noted that no planning history can be found for the front and side dormer at no. 7 which were in situ at the time of the permission at no. 8. The dormers granted at no. 8 are considered harmful to the host building as they dominate the roof slope and demonstrate the harmful impact such developments have on the original character of a building.
- 3.4. It is noted that the neighbouring semi-detached pair at nos. 11-12 have front and side dormers. This semi-detached pair is modern development although designed in a similar style to the neighbouring historic buildings (granted under ref. PWX0002589 dated 11/01/2001). This semi-detached building is a storey higher than the application building and has a steeper roof pitch to that of the application building. The increased height of

this building and roof profile ensures that the dormers do not dominate the roofslope and front elevation. These dormers are therefore not be considered as a precedent for front and side dormers at the application site.

- 3.5. It is noted that no. 5, which is part of a semi-detached building (nos. 6 and 5), does have a front dormer which were granted under ref. 8803592 dated 13/04/1988. However, this permission was granted over 31 years ago, well before the adoption of the Council's current design and heritage policies, and should not be considered as a justification for similar development. Similarly no. 3, which is part of a semi-detached building (nos. 3 and 4) has a front dormer. It is noted that no planning history can be found for this dormer and it should not be considered as a precedent for a similar form of development.
- 3.6. Para 196 of the NPPF (2018) states that 'where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use'. The proposal would result in 'less than substantial harm' to the character, appearance and historic interest of the conservation area as well as to the host property. There is no demonstrable public benefit that would outweigh this harm
- 3.7. The proposal would provide no public benefits to outweigh the less than substantial harm to the conservation area. 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 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.

Rear dormer

- 3.8. The application also includes the installation of a rear dormer, which is identical to that granted permission under application reference 2018/6386/P. The reasons for granting permission state that *'the principle of the proposed rear dormer extension is considered acceptable given that there is an existing rear dormer at neighbouring property No. 10 which the application building forms a semi-detached pair with. The erection of the rear dormer window would therefore restore a balance to the pair of buildings at roof level. The scale, bulk and detailed design of the proposed rear dormer considered to have an acceptable impact upon the pair of buildings and the wider conservation area. The decision making process had due regard to the Local Plan, and was assessed under current policies A1, D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017, Camden planning guidance, the London Plan 2016, and the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.*
The rear

4. Amenity

- 4.1. Policy A1 of the Local Plane states the Council will seek to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected from development. The factors the Council will consider the impact on daylight/sunlight, noise, overlooking, outlook, and artificial light levels (light spillage).
- 4.2. By virtue of its position on the roof, set back from the eaves, the proposed rear dormer windows would not cause any harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

5. Recommendation

Refuse planning permission.