

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	10/01/2022
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	12/12/2021
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Nora-Andreea Constantinescu			2021/4549/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
4 F Frogna London NW3 6AJ			See 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>				
Enlargement of the rear dormer and new side dormer, and replacement of two rooflights into a larger rooflight to rear roof slope.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Site notices were posted on 17/11/2021 and expired on 11/12/2021. Press notices were issued on 18/11/2021 and expired on 12/12/2021.</p> <p>No comments have been received from neighbouring occupiers.</p>					
<b>Heath and Hampstead Society</b>	<p>HHS have objected to the proposed scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both proposed dormers are unacceptable, too large and out of scale with the host building</li> <li>• The proposal would harm the quality of the Conservation Area</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer Response:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Agreed. The proposed dormers are overly dominant for the existing roofslope.</i></li> <li>• <i>Agreed. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.</i></li> </ul>					

## Site Description

The application site is located on the southern side of Frognal. The property is a semi-detached four storey property, divided into six flats. The proposal relates to the flat at the third-floor level.

The application property does lie within Redington Frognal conservation area and within Redington and Frognal Neighbourhood Plan area.

## Relevant History

Relevant planning records at the application site:

**G6/3/7/37114-** Alterations to two existing ground floor flats and change of use and works of conversion to form a three bedroom self-contained flat on the second floor and a three bedroom self-contained maisonette on the second/third floors including the construction of a side dormer, a new first floor rear balcony, and the enclosure of the existing second floor front balcony to provide additional habitable floor space. **Granted 1983**

Relevant planning records at neighbouring sites:

**29514** – 8 Frognal - Change of use and works of conversion to provide 8 self-contained flats, the erection of two new dormer windows at the side and rear, and the provision of a roof terrace at first floor rear. – **Granted 01/04/1980** (rear dormer width 2.3m, height 2.3m; side dormer width 4.4m, 2.1m)

**9401411** - 1 Frognal - Works of alteration inclusive of erection of a front dormer window raising at rear first floor parapet and creation of a terrace new staircase and french doors to front of basement flat. - Grant full planning permission **20/01/1995** (rear dormer shown as existing – no planning records for it)

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2021

### London Plan 2021

### Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 – Design

Policy D2 – Heritage

Policy DM1 – Delivery and monitoring

Policy CC1 – Climate change mitigation

Policy CC2 – Adapting to climate change

### Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CGP – Design

CPG – Home Improvements

CPG – Amenity

CPG – Energy efficiency and adaptation

### Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Plan

Policy SD2 – Redington Frognal Conservation Area

Policy SD5 – Dwellings: Extensions and garden development

### Redington Frognal Conservation Area Appraisal (2000)

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1 The applicant seeks planning consent to enlarge the existing rear dormer, replace the existing two rooflights with a larger one on the rear roof slope and erect a new side dormer.

- The proposed rear dormer would have a width of 4.9m, depth of 2.8m, height of 2.5m. This would be larger than existing by 2.4m in width, 1.3m in depth and 1.2m in height.
- The proposed side dormer would have width of 2.6m, depth of 1.9m, height of 2m.
- The proposed rooflight would have a width of 1.6m and a length of 1.3m as measured on the roofplan.

### 2. Design and Conservation

2.1. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. 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 host building and neighbouring ones, and the quality of materials to be used.

2.2. Policy D2 states that the Council will seek to manage development in a way that retains the distinctive character of conservation areas and their significance and will therefore only grant planning permission for development that preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the area.

2.3. Redington Froggal Neighbourhood Plan states that extensions to dwellings must ensure they are subordinate to the main dwelling.

2.4. In relation to dormer roof extensions, the CPG Home Improvements guidance indicates that they should be subordinate in size to the roof slope being extended, maintain even distances to the roof margins, their design should consider the hierarchy of window openings and that generally roofs of properties within a Conservation Areas are part of the areas character, and as a general rule, dormer windows should retain a greater area of roof slope than properties outside Conservation Areas in order to preserve this character.

2.5. The properties along Froggal Road adjacent to the application side have been previously extended with rear and side dormers, the majority of which do not have planning records but appear to have been in situ historically. Some properties have two dormers on their rear roof slope, such as Nos. 6, 10, 12 and 14 which based on Google aerial views appear to maintain a proportionate area of the roof slope being subordinate in scale and projection.

2.6. The proposed enlargement to the rear dormer, due to its scale and projection would cover more than 50% of the rear roof slope, which is contrary to the Home Improvements guidance. The proposed roof structure would be visually incongruous, and overly dominate the roof of the property. No consideration has been given to the hierarchy of spaces and openings of the existing building, given that the proposed dormer would have three sets of double doors which are considerably larger than the windows below. As such, the proposed enlargement to the existing dormer would result in a disproportionate addition to the host building, which would harm the roof form, the character and appearance of the host building and wider area, and unbalance the semi-detached pair.

2.7. In terms of detailed design, the proposed dormer would have openable glazed doors with railings in front. The railings measure 0.7m in height which is not considered sufficient to ensure the safety of occupiers when opening the doors. Furthermore, the long line of railings at this level, projecting over 4.3m in length, would result in additional clutter and detract from the architectural integrity of the roof slope.

2.8. The replacement of the existing rear rooflights with a larger one, would result in further erosion of the roofslope, as seen in association with the incongruous proposed rear dormer extension. The existing two rear rooflights have a vertical emphasis, whilst the proposal would increase this glazed area horizontally, causing harm to the existing roof form and its appearance.

2.9. The proposed side dormer would sit closer to the rear slope of the building. Due to its position and location, would not maintain even distances to the roof margins and appear to dominate the roofslope. Whilst the proposed openings would be slightly smaller than the ones below, due to its size and projection, the proposed dormer would be harmful to existing roof form, the character and appearance of the host building and wider area.

2.10. Given the site lies within a conservation area, special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area. As such, the proposed extensions and alterations due to their scale, projection, position and detailed design, would result in harm to the existing roof form, its character and appearance, and that of the host building and semi-detached pair, and the application will be refused on these grounds.

### **3. Amenity**

3.1. Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbouring ones by only granting permission for development that would not harm their amenity. The main factors which are considered to impact the amenity of neighbouring residents are overlooking, loss of outlook and sense of enclosure, implications on daylight, sunlight, light pollution and noise.

3.2. The proposed enlargement of rear dormer and rear rooflight, due to their position and projection, would not result in harm to the neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of light, outlook, light pollution, or noise.

3.3. The proposed side dormer, due to the existing pattern of development the side dormer would not result in harmful overlooking, reduction in light, light pollution or noise to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

3.4 The development is thus considered to be in accordance with planning policies A1 however still fail in accordance with policies D1 and D2.

### **4. Conclusion**

4.1. The proposed rear dormer and rooflight by reason of their bulk, detailed design, scale and siting would result in harm to the existing roof form, the character and appearance of the host building, semi-detached pair and wider Redington Frongal Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017), and policy SD5 of Redington Frongal Neighbourhood Plan.

4.2. The proposed side dormer by reason of its bulk, detailed design, scale and siting would result in harm to the existing roof form, character and appearance of the host building, semi-detached pair and wider Redington Frongal Conservation Area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017), and policy SD5 of Redington Frongal Neighbourhood Plan.

### **5. Recommendation**

#### **5.1. Refuse planning permission**