

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Extended Expiry Date:	28/06/2023
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	13/02/2023
Officer		Application Number(s)		
Blythe Smith		2022/5013/P		
Application Address		Drawing Numbers		
2 Richborough Road London NW2 3LU		See decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of a single storey ground floor side/rear extension to flats 3 and 4.				
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	02	No. of objections	02
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 20/01/2023 and the consultation period expired on 13/02/2023.</p> <p>2 responses were received during the consultation period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The proposal would result in an overdevelopment of the site/ overbearing/out of scale development- Impact to the amenity of units 2-4- Issues with bill payments- Disrepair of property and internal fittings of building not working- Pest infestation					
Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood forum	Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood forum were consulted and no response was received.					

Site Description

The application site is located on the north-west side of Richborough Road and comprises a two-storey semi-detached property (main house) with a single storey rear extension and a single storey outbuilding in the rear garden. The main house has been divided into flats.

The building is not listed or located within a Conservation Area, but is within the Fortune Green Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Relevant History

Application site

2020/0652/P – Installation of a replacement roof covering with an increased ridge height, together with the installation of a front elevation window of existing bedsit – **Granted 08-09-2020**

2018/2436/P – Erection of a single storey ground floor side/rear extension to flats 3 and 4. – **Refused 28/08/2018**

Reason 1

The proposed extension by reason of the loss of rear garden space would result in overdevelopment of the site and would appear as an unduly dominant form of development contrary to policies D1 and A2 of Camden's Local Plan and Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015).

Reason 2

The proposed development, by reason of its layout, would result in harm to the quality of amenity of the occupants of studios 2-4, contrary to policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

2009/5227/P – Pitched roof addition to rear outbuilding (storage area and bedsit). – **Refused 04/11/2010**

2008/4221/P – Retention of part (side boundary wall and flat roof over) of single storey rear extension to provide an open storage area to the existing residential units. – **Granted 21/10/2008**

8600309 – Change of use including works of conversion to form two self-contained flats and the erection of a single storey rear extension with roof terrace over. – **Granted 26/03/1986**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

London Plan (2021)

Camden's Local Plan (2017)

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy A2 – Open space

Policy D1 – Design

Supplementary Guidance

CPG Design 2021

CPG Amenity 2021

CPG Home Improvements 2021

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015)

Policy 2: Design and Character

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for a single storey side/rear extension to flats 3 and 4 measuring 9.9m deep, 1.1m wide and a height of 2.8m with a flat roof. The extension steps in near the main rear elevation of the host property to maintain a rear access to flat 2.
- 1.2 The applicant is proposing to remove the outdoor storage area, freeing up 13.6m² of space in the rear amenity area.

2. Background

- 2.1 A similar scheme was proposed in 2018 this featured the side/rear extension with the same dimensions but retaining the outbuilding. This was refused under amenity concerns over units 2-4 and the over development of the site (see planning history for full reasons for refusal). The applicant has come back with additional documents from the HMO licensing team to try to overcome the previous reasons for refusal.

3. Assessment

- 3.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:
- Design and Appearance
 - Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

4. Design and Appearance

- 4.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to respect local context and character. Camden's design policies are supported by Camden Planning Guidance documents 'Design' and 'Home Improvements' which advise that extensions should be subordinate to the building being extended in terms of location, form, footprint, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing, and that extensions should allow for the retention of a reasonably sized garden.
- 4.2 Policy A2 (Open Space) advises that development within rear gardens and other undeveloped areas can have a significant impact upon the amenity and character of the area. It also states that the Council will resist development that occupies an excessive part of the garden.
- 4.3 Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan seeks that all development shall be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead. It further states that extensions - and infill development - should be in character and proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties. Also that development should have regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of its context - including the scale, mass, orientation, pattern and grain of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces.
- 4.4 The street pattern is characterised by the repeated forms of closely spaced semi-detached properties. The rear gardens of the properties on the north-west side of the Richborough Road increase in sizes towards the east end of the road. The application site is located close to the west end of Richborough Road and has a shorter rear garden than many of the properties on the north- west side of the Richborough Road. Many of the properties in the vicinity have rear extensions and outbuilding or garden sheds in their rear gardens within a proportional scale to

the original host dwelling. The existing rear outbuilding is located 5.2m away from the single storey rear extension on the main house.

- 4.5 The main house has already been excessively extended towards the rear garden with a large extension and rear outbuilding which consume most of the rear garden, leaving limited useable garden space. The proposed 9.9m deep side/rear extension would further erode the existing garden space and result in narrow walkway of 0.9m wide, the removal of the storage space would give the occupants around 35sqm of useable garden space. The original garden space based on the existing pattern of development is believed to be close to 115sqm. Based on this figure the overall reduction of garden space is estimated to be close to 70%. While the garden space would become a more usable shape this would lead to the loss of the bicycle and bin storage with no other location specified, it is expected that this would continue to be in the same location and the usable space for the tenants would not significantly increase. Therefore, the development would result in a further decrease in the amount of already limited garden space that the occupiers can enjoy and use for amenity and recreational activities. Therefore the development is considered to be unduly dominant in the rear amenity space.
- 4.6 On the side elevation two windows and a door are proposed. The application form states that the proposed fenestration would match the existing. Design CPG states that uPVC windows are not acceptable both aesthetically and for environmental reasons, including their relatively short lifespan and inability to biodegrade. However it is noted that the existing fenestration appears to be uPVC and therefore the impact of replacement windows in the same materials is unlikely to result in significant additional harm.
- 4.7 Overall the development would result in harm to the character and appearance of the site and wider area.

5. Amenity

- 5.1 Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected including visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.
- 5.2 It is apparent that the existing walkway on the side adjacent to No.1 Richborough Road which is used to access flats 3 and 4 is already very narrow, restricted and cramped. The proposal would further erode into this confined space. It is noted that studio 2 of the host property is served only by a partially glazed door and 2x small and narrow obscure windows surrounding the door on the rear elevation. It is considered that this studio already receives a very poor quality of light and that the proposal would be a further detriment to their amenity by restricting light to this studio. In addition while the proposal will marginally increase the floor space of the substandard and poor quality accommodation of studio 3 and 4, it would also result in a loss of outlook to both studios as the extension would bring them closer the existing brick boundary wall shared with No.1 Richborough Road.
- 5.3 The adjoining property No.1 Richborough Road has been converted into 3 flats and it is observed that that the rear patio doors adjacent to the proposed extension serve as the only light source to the bedroom of the garden flat. However, given the relatively low height of the extension (2.5m high) and height of the existing shared boundary wall, the proposal is not considered to further exacerbate the existing situation and result in significant loss of light to this property to an extent that warrant a reason for refusal. The proposed side windows will not face directly onto the rear extension of No.1 Richborough Road and are therefore not considered to create issues of overlooking or loss of privacy.

- 5.4 It is acknowledged that flats 3 and 4 are currently substandard and constitute a poor quality of accommodation and that the proposal would marginally improve the floorspace of each unit. However, it is considered that this minor benefit does not outweigh the harm of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property or the amenity of the studio flats (No2-4) of No.2 Richborough Road.
- 5.5 The applicant has submitted supporting documents from the Camden housing team stating that the units 3 and 4 need to increase in size to meet minimum HMO standards and that combining the two units was suggested. It is not considered that this outweighs the impact on the amenity of the occupiers of these units or the over development of the site. Furthermore, the two units could be combined into one to improve the standard of accommodation without the necessity for additional extension. As such, this is not considered sufficient justification for the proposals.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 The proposed extension by reason of the loss of rear garden space would result in overdevelopment of the site and would appear as an unduly dominant form of development contrary to policies D1 and A2 of Camden's Local Plan 2017 and Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015).
- 6.2 The development, by reason of its layout, would result in harm to the quality of amenity of the occupants of studios 2-4, contrary to policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

7. Recommendation

- 7.1 Refuse planning permission.

