

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		20/03/2013	
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		14/02/2013	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Sam Fowler				2013/0124/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
Flat 1 88 Hillfield Road London NW6 1QA				Refer to 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>							
Erection of single storey rear lower ground floor level extension in connection with existing lower ground floor flat (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse					
<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	17	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		One letter of objection was received, that stated the the proposed development would cause an undue loss of light to the neighbouring bedroom window.					
<b>Local groups comments:</b>		No responses have been received to date					

## Site Description

The application relates to a lower-ground floor level flat in a two-storey-mid-terrace plus semi-basement property on the south side of Hillfield Road. The property has a single storey rear extension, which is conservatory style with a glass roof.

The site is not within a conservation area.

## Relevant History

**13539** – Planning permission was granted on 26/07/1972 for the conversion of 88, Hillfield Road NW6, into two self-contained flats and one self-contained maisonette.

**8703047** – Planning permission was granted on 13/01/1988 for the erection of a single-storey extension at rear basement (garden) level.

**2009/3152/P** – Planning permission was granted on 16/09/2009 for the replacement of the single storey rear extension, replacement of the existing rear timber patio doors with new upvc patio doors and insertion of a new opening for upvc windows on the side elevation of the existing rear addition.

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2012

### London Plan 2011

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 - Design

## Assessment

### Proposal:

The proposal seeks planning permission to partially infill the space between the rear extension and the western flank boundary. The rooms would be reconfigured, with the existing kitchen and conservatory replaced by a lounge and breakfast area respectively, and the kitchen moved into the proposed extension.

### Assessment:

The main issues to be considered are the design impact on character of the proposal and the potential impact on neighbouring amenity.

### Design / Impact on character:

Development plan policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the Council's LDF require all developments to be of a high standard design and take into consideration the character, setting, context, form and scale of the host building and surrounding properties.

Camden's Design Guidance states that rear extensions should be:

- secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area.
- The width of rear extensions should respect the rhythm of existing rear extensions.

In a review of neighbouring properties, rear extensions have been made at ground floor level to the width of the rear projection element, but not the full width of the property, thus retaining a visual gap between pairs of dwellings. By constructing a full width rear extension the proposal would be creating a development that would fail to respect the character and appearance of the existing building, as well as similar buildings in the surrounding area.

It was noted by the applicant at the time of the site visit that there had been a similar style extension undertaken at what appeared to be no. 84A Hillfield Road. A review of Council's history for this site indicates that a single storey rear extension had been undertaken at this property, however it wasn't full width, nor would it infill the space between the detached flank boundary and rear projection to the same level as the proposed development. This extension had been designed to maintain a clear visual gap between both flank boundaries of the property.

Therefore the proposed development is considered to be contrary to the above guidance as the proposed extension is not considered to be subservient to the parent building, does not respect the proportions of the original building, nor does it respect the rhythm of existing rear additions to the terrace. Therefore, it is considered to be contrary to Policy DP24 of Camden's LDF 2010 and also fails to comply with Camden's Design Guidance.

#### **Impact on amenity:**

Under 4.10 of CPG1, it states that rear extension developments should be designed to "not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;"

The only neighbours considered to be potentially affected by the proposal is no. 86 Hillfield Road, as the proposed development would be located along the shared flank boundary with this property. The proposal would be contained within the existing rear extension when considered in relation to the property to the east (no. 90).

The property at no. 86 has a window for a habitable room (bedroom) within the rear elevation, and due to the orientation of the properties, the creation of the extension would likely cause a significant loss of sunlight and daylight to this window within no. 86 and harm outlook by creating an sense of enclosure. The applicant has not submitted a daylight and sunlight study which suggests otherwise. In the absence of a daylight and sunlight assessment, the proposal is considered unacceptable, as it would cause an undue loss of amenity to the occupiers of the neighbouring property.

In addition, the proposal shows a separate room, identified as a lounge, which would gain its main source of light from the lightwell proposed between the main rear wall of the building and the proposed extension. At present this room would receive the majority of its light from the existing flank window, and also from the openings between the room and the conservatory style extension. However, it is noted that the window for this room would be positioned immediately adjacent to the northern wall of the proposed extension. Given that the extension would be orientated to the south of the property, which is the line the sun follows, and its roofline would be altered to no longer be of glass design, it is considered that the proposal has the potential to create a habitable room within the property that would not receive sufficient daylight/sunlight as well. However, as other rooms within the flat receive ample levels of daylight/sunlight this would not warrant refusal.

**Conclusion:**

Overall the proposal is not considered to preserve the appearance of the host building and would cause an undue impact to the residential amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring property at no. 86 Hillfield Road. The development would therefore fail to comply with the aims and objectives of core policy CS14 and development plan policies DP24 and DP26 of the LDF.

**Recommendation:**

Refuse permission