

| | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | Expiry Date: | 22/06/2021 |
| (Refusal) | | N/A / attached | Consultation Expiry Date: | 30/05/2021 |
| Officer | | | Application Number(s) | |
| Joshua Ogunleye | | | 2021/2253/P | |
| Application Address | | | Drawing Numbers | |
| 56 Hillway London N6 6EP | | | See decision notice | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | |
| | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | |
| Installation of an access rooflight on the rear roofslope and the formation of a second floor rear roof terrace with associated balustrades | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | Refuse planning permission | | | |
| Application Type: | Householder Planning Application | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Decision Notice | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | No. of responses | 02 | No. of objections | 01 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | <p>No. Electronic 00</p> <p>Site notice consultation: 11/06/2021 until 05/07/2021 Press notice consultation: 17/06/2021 until 05/07/2021</p> <p>One letter of objection was received from neighbours at 54 Hillway. Details are summarised below.</p> <p>The terrace extends up to the party wall with our property. We have several seating and eating areas both close to the back of the house and towards the rear of the garden. We disagree with the Design Statement claim that there would only be a slight increase in visibility over neighbours gardens no worse than what can currently be seen from the second floor rear windows of No 54.</p> <p>The roof terrace would cover a large area of over 200 sq ft. We note that No 56 has had two rear extensions beyond the original building line. Firstly, in 1986 on the ground floor out from the back and in 1991 by adding a second storey above. The roof terrace would be a third additional level to the original property.</p> <p>If the project goes ahead, the use of frosted, not clear, glass on at least the side panel adjacent to our property would substantially limit overview, while having minimal visual impact. When the house is used by people we do not know we are concerned about possible noise and disturbance with visitors congregating at any time of day or evening on such a large space.</p> <p>If permission is to be granted, we ask that it should be made subject to appropriate conditions restricting noise, hours of use and numbers of users.</p> | | | |
| Holly Lodge Conservation Area and Advisory Committee. | <p>Object-</p> <p>The proposed terrace would overlook the interior and exterior spaces of neighbouring properties.</p> | | | |

Site Description

This application relates to a two storey, semi-detached interwar dwelling house on the eastern side of Hillway, close to the corner of Oakshott Avenue. The property is characterised by its white rendered exterior, red tiled hipped roof, a front gable and a substantial rear garden area.

More contemporary additions to the property include the erection of a two storey rear extension, a side dormer and a front rooflight.

The property is within the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area and is recognised as a positive contributor. The site is also in the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan area. The property is not statutorily or locally listed.

Relevant History

Preapplication scheme for Installation of an access rooflight on the rear roofslope and the formation of a roof terrace with associated balustrades – Applicant informally advised that the principle of a second floor roof terrace within this context would be unacceptable.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

London Plan 2021

Camden Plan 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

Other Planning Policies / Guidance

CPG Altering and extending your home (2021)

CPG Design (2021)

CPG Amenity (2021)

Highgate Neighbourhood Plan

DH2 Development Proposals in Highgate's Conservation Areas

DH5 Roofs and Roofscape

Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy Camden (2012)

Assessment

1.1. Proposal

- 1.2. Installation of an access rooflight on the rear roofslope and the formation of a roof terrace with associated balustrades

Revisions

- 1.3. No revisions were sought in the determination of this application.

2. Assessment

Design policy and guidance

- 2.1. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions are proposed. Policy D1 of the Local Plan requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area; and Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings. Camden's Local Plan is supported by CPG documents 'Design' and 'Altering and extending your home' and the Camden Town Conservation Area Statement.
- 2.2. Policy D2 of the local plan seeks to preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens and locally listed heritage assets.
- 2.3. Special regard has been attached to the desirability of preserving or enhancing 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.
- 2.4. Paragraph 4.2 – 4.3 of the Camden 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 skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene, in particular where it would alter an unbroken run of valley roofs.

Local Character

- 2.5. The character of the conservation area is homogeneous; a housing development based on a 1923 masterplan rooted in garden suburb principles. The developer's rectilinear plan was imposed onto the mature grounds of Holly Lodge, a large mansion. The development also includes a parade of shops on the southern boundary.
- 2.6. The defining view is from the top of Hillway looking south to central London, framed by the avenue of mature trees, and the houses which follow the curve of hill. The pattern of roofs and gables, and front gardens marks the changes in level. There is a rhythm created by the spacing of the houses and the gaps between them. Many of the houses, particularly on Hillway, are linked by a single storey garage set well back from the building line. Where a second floor has been added the rhythm is harmed because the definition of the gap is reduced, the houses become fused into a terrace form, and the views through the greenery beyond is lost.
- 2.7. The symmetrical house forms are used both within the streets and to articulate the junctions between branch roads and the principal 'spine road' (the junction of Hillway with Oakeshott, Makepeace and Langbourne Avenues).

Design issues

- 2.8. The proposed second floor rear roof terrace would cover the entire flat roof area of an existing

two storey rear extension. It would be accessed via a proposed full height rooflight window that opens up to become a door similar to a Velux Cabrio. The proposed opening would result in the loss of the eaves in this section of the roof.

- 2.9. The proposed rooflight would measure 0.8m x 2.1m, and be fitted off centre along the rear roofslope. The proposed scale would dominate the rear roofslope. Therefore, it is considered that the works would appear detrimental to the character within the host property's roof. It is considered its proximity to the sloping hip ridge would result in it appearing overly dominant, within the context of a modest roof form. The proposed scale would be contrary to section 2.1 of the Home Improvement CPG which states that developments should maintain a margin from the roof's eaves
- 2.10. The proposed roof terrace would be enclosed by 1.1m high glass balustrades set in from the edges by 250mm. The terrace area would measure 6.3m wide and 3.7m deep at its longest part. Whilst the installation of frameless glass balustrades would typically be considered high quality contemporary additions, their addition here would not be considered appropriate within this setting where it would appear forward of the main roof from Oakeshott Avenue. The extensive balustrading around this large terrace will create high level visual clutter. It is considered that the proposed materials would constitute an intrusive ultra-modern intervention within the context that would be visible from the surrounding streetscene.
- 2.11. The proposed balustrades and rooflight would be visible from the public realm. It would sit on an already altered roof which breaks from the uniform appearance of the streetscene. It is considered the proposed rear rooflight and rear balustrade additions would further detract from the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area.
- 2.12. Furthermore, whilst it is noted that there are other flat roof structures associated with neighbouring properties, none appear to be in formal use as a flat roof terrace area. Therefore, the proposed alterations would break from the prevailing character along this section of the conservation area. There is a concern that use of the terrace will encourage the positioning of semi-permanent ancillary paraphernalia here, such as parasols, seating furniture, plant pots windbreaks etc, which will create further unwelcome visual clutter at this exposed high level. It is considered the proposed alterations would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the host building and Holly Lodge Conservation Area.
- 2.13. Overall, the proposals would result in harm to the host building's appearance and character and the Holly Lodge Conservation Area. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the designated heritage, which the Council considers is not outweighed by any public benefits brought forward by the scheme. The provision of a roof terrace is considered to have limited public benefit.

Amenity issues

- 2.14. It is considered that the proposed rear facing rooflight window would facilitate views similar to the existing conditions. Therefore, officers do not consider the proposed rooflight would give rise to adverse overlooking.
- 2.15. The proposed works would provide 21sqm of roof terrace space in addition to an extensive rear garden. Given its ancillary use within a residential setting, despite its large size, it is not considered that any noise generated from its use would give rise to adverse neighbourly harm.
- 2.16. The second floor roof terrace would adjoin the side roofs of Nos.54 and 58 Hillway. It is noted that both neighbouring properties have dormers with habitable rooms within their roof space on their side and rear roof slopes. In particular angled views would be possible into the side dormers of both neighbours of No.54 and 58 Hillway. Also there is significant opportunity for intrusive overlooking down into the rear garden areas immediately at the rear of the adjoining houses. Although a reduction in depth back from the roof edge may prevent views to the

gardens, it will not prevent rearwards side views to the side dormers.

- 2.17. The only acceptable mitigation would therefore be achieved by adding a privacy screen. However, the addition of a semi-solid privacy screen 1.8m high along the terrace's full depth and width would add additional bulk to the host property's rear elevation such that it appears as another storey. It is considered that this would harm the rear elevation of the host building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. This would appear incongruous within the context as rear projections within the rear garden area typically have a hipped roof cover.
- 2.18. It is considered that the separation distance between the proposed roof terrace and the neighbouring windows at No.54 and No.58 is not sufficient enough to address any significant overlooking impact.

3. Conclusion

- 3.1. The proposed rear rooflight and balustrade enclosure, by virtue of their inappropriate scale, location and detailed design, would result in adverse visual clutter that would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the building and the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017 and policies DH2 and DH5 of the Highgate Neighbourhood Plan 2017.
- 3.2. The proposed rear roof terrace, by reason of its size, depth, and location, would result in overlooking to the side dormer windows and rear gardens of Nos.54 and No.58 Hillway to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbouring properties, contrary to policy A1 (Amenity) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1. REFUSE planning permission