

|   |  |                                 |                                     |   |                            |
|---|--|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| <b>Delegated Report</b>   |  | <b>Analysis sheet</b>           |                                     | <b>Expiry Date:</b> 28/03/2023              |                            |
|   |  | N/A                             |                                     | <b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b> 02/07/2023 |                            |
| <b>Officer</b>  |  |                                 | <b>Application Number(s)</b>        |   |                            |
| Brendan Versluys  |  |                                 | 2023/0419/P                         |   |                            |
| <b>Application Address</b>  |  |                                 | <b>Drawing Numbers</b>              |   |                            |
| 2 Quickswood<br>London<br>NW3 3SJ   |  |                                 | See 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>  |  |                                 |                                     |   |                            |
| Erection of an additional storey (part of which was granted as Prior Approval ref. 2021/4368/P)   |  |                                 |                                     |   |                            |
| <b>Recommendation(s):</b>   |  | Refuse Planning Permission      |                                     |   |                            |
| <b>Application Type:</b>  |  | Householder Planning Permission |                                     |   |                            |
| <b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>   |  | Refer to Draft Decision Notice  |                                     |   |                            |
| <b>Informatives:</b>  |  |                                 |                                     |   |                            |
| <b>Consultations</b>  |  |                                 |                                     |   |                            |
| <b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>   | <b>No. notified</b>  | 0                               | <b>No. of responses</b>             | 1   | <b>No. of objections</b> 1 |
| <b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>   | <p>Two site notices were displayed near to the site on the 24/03/2023 (consultation end date 17/04/2023) and additional site notices were display following re-consultation for revised Daylight and Sunlight Report on 08/06/2023 (consultation end date 02/07/2023).</p> <p><u>One objection</u> was received from the owner/occupier of 2 Conybeare and can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There will be a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of 2 Conybeare due to a substantial reduction in daylight and sunlight, and additional overshadowing.</li> </ul> <p><u>Officer's response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Daylight and sunlight effects are assessed under section 6 of this report.</i></li> </ul> |                                 |                                     |   |                            |
| <b>Site Description</b>   |  |                                 |                                     |   |                            |
| The site is a two-storey corner dwelling house located on the eastern side of the road, located within a planned residential estate (known as the Chalcot Estate) between Fellows Road to the north and King Henry's Road to the south, dating from the 1960's. |  |                                 |                                     |   |                            |

The site is within a group of six 'L' shaped houses which form terraces, with each property of fronting onto Quickswood or Conybeare. Numbers 2 and 3 Quickswood and numbers 1 and 2 Conybeare are arranged in a square/block.

Numbers 1, 2 and 3 Conybeare face east and 2, 4 and 6 Quickswood face west. 1 and 2 Conybeare and 2 and 4 Quickswood have gardens that adjoin to the rear forming internal courtyard gardens. 1 and 2 Conybeare also have gardens to the south. 3 Conybeare and 6 Quickswood form the end of the terrace with gardens at the northern end of the block. The group match in terms of their design, scale, form and materials.

The L shape is formed by a principal part along the street, and a rear projection on the southern half.

The application site is not a listed building and is not situated within a Conservation Area but is adjacent to the Elsworthy Conservation Area to the south on the opposite side of King Henry's Road.

## Relevant History

### Site History:

#### Application site:

**2021/4368/P** - Erection of an additional storey on existing dwelling house . **Prior Approval Granted 19/05/2022 ("the previous PA"). This is over the principal part.**

#### 1 Conybeare

**2023/2672/P** - Erection of additional storey to the principal part of the existing dwellinghouse. **Prior Approval Granted 25/07/2024**

## Relevant Policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2021

### The London Plan 2021

### Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 Design

### Camden Planning Guidance (CPG)

CPG Design (January 2021)

CPG Amenity (January 2021)

CPG Home Improvements (January 2021)

## Assessment

### 3. Proposal

- 3.1. Planning permission is sought for a second floor extension to the existing dwelling. The extension follows the same footprint as the existing first floor. The previous PA granted permission for the part of this proposal on the principal part of the building, and so this represents a fallback. This proposes that same extension (in form) over the principal part, but with an additional section over the rear projection, filling the existing building footprint. Therefore the additional section to the rear is the key consideration (taking account of the previous PA fallback).

3.2. The extension would accommodate three bedrooms, two bathrooms and a study.

#### 4. Planning Considerations

4.1. The material considerations in the determination of this application are as follows:

- Design and Heritage
- Amenity

#### Assessment of proposals

#### 5. Design and Heritage

5.1. The Council's Design 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. Development should respect the local area in context and character; preserve or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets; comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; integrate well with the surrounding streets; respond to natural features and preserves gardens and other open space; incorporate high quality landscape design and maximise opportunities for soft landscaping, preserve strategic and local views.

5.2. Guidance contained within CPG 'Design' states that design should respond positively to context and character and integrate well with the existing character of a place, building and its surroundings. In addition, development in conservation areas should only be permitted if it preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5.3. The CPG Home improvements states the following in regard to roof extensions

*A successful roof extension would consider the overall roof form of the existing building, adjoining buildings and impact in key views (when relevant) and be proportionate to the roof slope being extended.*

5.4. The CPG Design states that a roof alteration or is likely to be acceptable where:

- *'Good quality materials and details are used and the visual prominence, scale and bulk would be appropriate having regard to the local context;*
- *There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would be a positive design solution, e.g. helping to reunite a group of buildings or townscape;*
- *Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form.*

5.5. The CPG also states a roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances where there is likely to be an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene

- *There is an unbroken run of valley roofs;*
- *Complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, even when a proposal involves adding to the whole terrace or group as a coordinated design;*
- *Buildings or terraces which already have an additional storey or mansard;*
- *Buildings already higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition;*

- *Buildings or terraces which have a roof line that is exposed to important London-wide and local views from public spaces;*
- *Buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves;*
- *The building is designed as a complete composition where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition at roof level;*
- *Buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form;*
- *Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by additional extension.*

5.6. The proposal seeks to extend the main part of the building by one storey to create three additional bedrooms and two additional bathrooms. The proposed additional storey would be positioned on the principal front and rear elevations of the building and would extend beyond the principal rear building line. The proposed floor to ceiling height would be approximately 2.4m high.

5.7. The proposed additional storey would match the existing building material palette and detailing with white painted render, brickwork, timber weather-board. The proposed windows would match the style and fenestration pattern of the existing, aligned with the windows located on the lower floors. As the additional storey will reflect the design of the existing building, the proposal is considered to be appropriate in design terms.

## **6. Residential Amenity**

6.1. Policy A1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. The policy notes that the factors to consider include: visual privacy and outlook; sunlight, daylight and overshadowing; artificial lighting levels; impacts of the construction phase; and noise and vibration.

6.2. In relation to light effects to the internal rooms of adjacent properties, the applicant has tested the existing and proposed VSC and sunlight values of 1 Conybeare, 2 Conybeare, and 4 Quickswood.

6.3. The results of the applicant's VCS analysis confirm the roof extension would maintain BRE compliant VSC values in relation to 1 Conybeare and 2 Conybeare (i.e. reductions would not reduce the value below 27% and the new value would not be less than 0.8 times the former value). In relation to 4 Quickswood, only one window at this property would not achieve BRE compliant VSC values. However, the room with this window is served by another window that achieves a VSC in excess of 39%. The room will therefore retain good access to daylight, demonstrated by the daylight distribution results. In addition, the window in question retains a VSC of 0.79 times the existing, just below the target 0.8 times and only 0.12% below, which it is considered would not be noticeable.

6.4. In terms of sunlight, the analysis has considered the access to sunlight of the rooms at 1 Conybeare and 2 Conybeare, and 4 Quickswood that have windows facing within 90° of due south. The results confirm all rooms will exceed the numerical values set out in the BRE guidelines and therefore the proposals will not have a significant effect on daylight and the BRE guidelines are achieved.

6.5. In relation to sunlight access to amenity spaces, the BRE Guidance outlines that at least 50% or 0.8 times the existing amenity area achieves 2 hours of sunlight on the 21<sup>st</sup> March. The applicant's Daylight & Sunlight information confirms that the existing amenity spaces at the adjacent properties of 4 Quickswood and 2 Conybeare enjoy 2 hours of sunlight on the 21<sup>st</sup> March over 14% and 37% of their amenity spaces respectively. The proposed roof

extension would reduce this sunlight access to 0% receiving 2hrs over these amenity spaces.

- 6.6. The loss of sunlight to both the amenity spaces of 4 Quickswood and 2 Conybeare on the 21<sup>st</sup> March, would be unacceptable.
- 6.7. No sunlight information has been provided with regard to the amenity space at 1 Conybeare, however it is considered that any additional loss of sunlight over the amenity space at this property would be very small, given the positioning of this amenity space relative to the application site and the (smaller) roof extension already approved at the application site under 2021/4368/P.
- 6.8. The proposed second storey is designed so that the main areas of outlook would be over Quickswood and King Henry's Road, with only a secondary bedroom window and a bathroom window with outlook over courtyard facing onto adjacent properties. As such, it is not considered that the proposed roof extension would result in any unacceptable impact with regards to privacy.
- 6.9. Despite the general compliance with VSC and sunlight values to internal spaces of adjacent properties, the proposed roof extension, which occupies the footprint of the entire existing roof, would cause excessive enclosure to 1 Conybeare, 2 Conybeare and 4 Quickswood, both to the internal living spaces and outdoor amenity spaces of these properties, particularly so to 2 Conybeare and 4 Quickswood which face directly onto the application site and the proposed roof extension. The roof extension would cause a unacceptable sense of enclosure, and unacceptable harmful impact to outlook generally.
- 6.10. Overall, owing to the size and positioning of the roof extension, the proposal would have unacceptable adverse external amenity effects with regard to daylight and sunlight.

## **7. Recommendations**

### **a) Refuse planning permission for the following reason-**

- 7.1. The proposed roof extension would result in an unacceptable detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring premises, particularly by reason of its height, scale and impact on light. The proposal would be contrary to policies D1 (Design) and A1 (Managing the impact of development) of Camden Council's Local Plan 2017.