

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		07/04/2021	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		17/04/2021	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Angela Ryan				2021/0631/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flat B 36 Kylemore Road London NW6 2PT				Refer to decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of roof extension with an 'L' shaped rear dormer, installation of 3 windows on the front roofslope, and installation of a glass balustrade on the flat roof of the rear extension to create a roof terrace							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was posted between 24/03/2021 and 17/04/2021. No comments/objections have been received as a result of the consultation process.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		N/A					

Site Description

The site comprises a two-storey building located on the west-side of Kylemore Road. The property is currently sub-divided into two self-contained residential units and lies within a terrace of similar type properties used for residential purposes.

The site is not listed nor does it lie within a designated conservation area.

The site lies within the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan area.

Relevant History

3 Kylemore Road

02/12/2005- Certificate of lawfulness for proposed development **granted** for the installation of four rooflights on the roof slope of the front elevation, the erection of a rear dormer extension on the main roof, and a roof extension on the rear wing to provide additional accommodation for a single-family dwelling house. (Ref: 2005/4030/P)

5 Kylemore Road (not full width)

19/04/2010- Permission **granted** for the erection of a rear dormer roof extension, installation of balustrade on flat roof of existing rear addition to use as roof terrace on second floor (attic) level and installation of two rooflights on front roof slope to existing first floor flat (Class C3). (Ref: 2010/0916/P)

8 Kylemore Road

25/11/2005- Permission **granted** for the erection of a rear dormer roof extension to create additional habitable accommodation to existing 1st floor flat, plus the erection of railings on the roof of the 3 storey rear extension for use as a roof terrace and insertion of 2 rooflights to the front elevation. (Ref: 2005/4192/P)

10 Kylemore Road

13/02/2012- Permission **granted** for the erection of dormer window in rear roof slope, creation of roof terrace enclosed by wooden trellis and balustrading at rear second floor level and installation of 2 rooflights on front roof slope all in connection with existing residential flat (Class C3). (Ref: 2012/0034/P)

13 Kylemore Road

11/02/2019- Permission **granted** for dormer extension to rear roof slope and addition of 2 rooflights in front roof slope. (Ref: 2018/6113/P)

Flat B 16 Kylemore Road

19/10/2010- Permission **granted** for the erection of rear dormer roof extension and glass balustrading to provide a terrace, and insertion of two rooflights to front roof slope to existing flat (Class C3) (Ref: 2010/4458/P)

21 Kylemore Road

19/01/2011- Permission **granted** for the erection of a dormer, installation of a roof light, and erection of a balustrade associated with the use of the flat roof of the existing three storey extension as a terrace to the rear of the flat on the upper floors (Class C3). (Ref: 2010/6379/P)

32 Kylemore Road

21/05/2018- Permission **granted** for the erection of rear dormer extension and installation of 3 rooflights to front elevation. (Ref: 2018/1513/P)

12/06/2018 - Certificate for Lawfulness **granted** for proposed Loft extension and alteration including construction of rear dormer and insertion of front rooflights. (2018/2483/P)

31/07/2018- Permission **refused** for the use of rear third storey flat roof as a terrace (Ref:

2018/2514/P). Subsequently allowed at appeal on 26/02/2019.

Relevant policies

Camden Local Plan 2017

D1 (Design)

A1 (Managing the Impact of development)

NPPF 2019: sections 2: paragraphs 7-9 & 4: paragraphs 38 & 47

London Plan 2021: Policy D4

Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015

Design and Character - Policy A14- (Roof extensions)

Camden Planning Guidance:

CPG- Design 2021: Chapters 1, 2 & 3

CPG- Home Improvements 2021: section 2.2.1

CPG- Amenity 2021: Chapters 1, 2 & 3

Assessment

1.0 Proposal:

1.1 The development is for a 'L' shaped rear dormer extension comprising a full width dormer on the main roof and an associated one on the rear wing. It is also proposed to install 3 rooflights on the front roofslope. A 1.1m high glass balustrade is proposed along the perimeters of the flat roof of the existing rear extension in order to facilitate a roof terrace.

1.2 The loft extension will accommodate a bedroom and en-suite shower room.

1.3 The key issues in the assessment of the proposed scheme are:

- Design;
- Impact on amenity

2.0 Design:

2.1 Policy D1 (Design) of Camden's Local Plan 2017 aims to achieve the highest standard of design in all developments, and be of the highest architectural and urban quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area. The policy also requires development to respect the local context and character.

2.2 Paragraph 2.2.1 of Camden's CPG 2021 (Home Improvements) stipulates that *"The aim of the dormer structure is to house a vertical window to bring in more light and air into the loft space and make it habitable, without adding to the overall roof height. The design of a dormer should therefore emphasise the glazing element and the solid structure should complement this in a form and scale appropriate to the roof being extended.*

Roof dormers should sit within the roof slope and appear as an extension to the existing roof whilst the existing roof form is maintained.

The Council also expects dormer windows to be subordinate in size to the roofslope being extended; and to maintain even distances to the roof margins (ridge, eaves, side parapet walls)".

2.3 Policy A14 in the Neighbourhood Plan relating to roof extensions stipulates that *"roof extensions and loft conversions should fit in with existing rooflines and be in keeping with existing development. Such extensions should be in proportion to the existing building and should not block views".*

2.4 Although there is a precedent for dormer extensions within the vicinity of the site, some being quite large, dormers in the form of 'L' shaped dormer extensions, as proposed here, are not a prevailing characteristic of the area. There is an example of an 'L' shaped dormer in close proximity to the site at no. 32 Kylemore Road. However, this was approved under a Certificate of Lawfulness application as the site is a single family dwelling house and therefore the Council would not be able to assess the planning merits of the application would have been limited. This 'L' shaped dormer is the only example of this type of dormer along the street. It should be noted that the earlier planning permission ref 2018/1513/P for a dormer at no.32 involved a smaller partial-width dormer which complied with policies. The development now proposed at no.36 does not exhibit features that the Council would seek in roof extensions. Each application needs to be assessed on its individual merits- an existing bulky 'L' shaped dormer extension, on which the Council would have had no jurisdiction over, should not be used as justification or setting a precedent for further examples elsewhere contrary to local planning policy and guidance..

2.5 The proposed 'L' shaped dormer is not sympathetic to the host building and fails to respect the host building. Both elements of it on the main roof and the rear wing are full width and considered excessively bulky and overbearing in terms of its height, form, scale and bulk. The full width L-shaped extension cannot be considered as a modest 'dormer' sitting within the roofslope and appears as an incongruous feature at roof level. It is considered to dominate and overwhelm the roofscape and would not be subordinate in terms of its relationship with the host building as advised by local design guidance. The siting, design and appearance of the proposed dormer extension would be an inappropriate addition to the host building detracting from its character and appearance and the area in general. The proposed L-shaped dormer also does not respect the prevailing pattern of development present on the rear of this terrace of buildings of which it forms a part and would set an unacceptable precedent for both fullwidth dormers as well as building on the flat roofs of the existing rear outriggers along this terrace of buildings.

2.6 The rooflights proposed on the front roofslope would have been acceptable in design terms, had the proposal been acceptable in all other respects.

2.7 The proposal is considered to be unacceptable in design and size terms and would detract from the character and appearance of the host building, setting an unacceptable precedent and is thereby contrary to policy D1 (Design of Camden's Local Plan 2017 and policy A14 of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015).

3.0 Amenity:

3.1 A 1.1m glass balustrade is proposed around the perimeter of the flat roof in order to facilitate a roof terrace. There is a precedent for roof terraces at the rear of properties on this side of the terrace of buildings. It is considered that the dormer elements of the proposal would not result in loss of privacy, outlook, daylight or sunlight.

3.2 The roof terrace here will allow angled views down into the top floor rear habitable room window of no.38 next door, so there will be loss of privacy to the detriment of existing residential amenity. This is illustrated by the photo in para 6.12 of the DAS for no.32 where a rearwards view is possible from the terrace; the proposed roof terrace at no.36 will have an identical situation and relationship. It should be noted that no.32 was allowed on appeal as it involved a 1.7m high privacy screen along the side which would prevent any views. However, only 1.1m high screens are proposed along the sides and if a 1.7m high screen was to be suggested to prevent this overlooking, that will only make the roof extension appear more bulky and visually intrusive.

4.0 Conclusion:

4.1 The proposal is considered to be unacceptable, due to its location, size, design and bulk, and would detract from the character and appearance of the host building and the area in general and would result in harmful overlooking to the detriment of existing residential amenities.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission