

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	17/01/2013
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	21/01/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Nicola Tulley			2012/6305/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
6 Fairhazel Gardens London NW6 3SG			See draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s) Erection of single-storey rear ground floor level extension, alterations to single-storey side extension including increase in height and erection of roof extension all in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).					
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission subject to S106			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	3	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>One letter of comment and one letter of support was received from local residents, the following comment was made:</p> <p>No objections to the improvement of the property however, the property is at the entrance to Fairfax Place and understood that 4 Fairhazel Gardens would be submitting similar plans to create a more balanced aspect for the surroundings. An extension to one side would look very odd.</p> <p><u>Officers response</u> A separate application for Number 4 Fairhazel Gardens was submitted at the same time. See assessment below.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	No letters of comment or objection have been received to date.					

Site Description

The application site relates to a modest two storey dwelling house on Fairhazel Gardens on the corner junction with Fairfax Place. This part of Fairhazel Gardens is characterised by a mix of commercial units and residential accommodation whereas Fairfax Place is predominately residential.

The site is in close proximity to South Hampstead Conservation Area.

Relevant History

Related planning application at 4 Fairhazel Gardens, reference 2012/6334/P, for the erection of extension at ground floor level and a roof level extension with front terrace all in connection with existing dwelling-house (Class C3).

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan: Spatial Development Strategy for Greater London: 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 Design

CPG6 Amenity

Assessment

Proposal and background

Two separate planning applications have been submitted at Numbers 4 & 6 Fairhazel Gardens. These properties are similarly proportioned and detailed corner buildings which mark the entrance into Fairfax Place. The buildings are of two storeys with flat roofs and high parapets. At ground level the rear gardens are quite limited in depth and do not benefit from a great degree of sunlight.

Both applications propose roof level and single storey rear extensions but have been submitted separately.

The following will assess the merits of the proposals at Number 6 Fairhazel Gardens in relation to design and appearance and amenity.

Amendments

Initially, the applicant had proposed a flat top mansard roof extension with front balcony area. Following advice from conservation and design officers the detailed design of the mansard roof extension has been amended and the front balcony removed from the proposal.

Design and appearance

The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions to existing buildings are proposed. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; development should consider the character and proportions of the existing building, where extensions and alterations are proposed; developments should consider the quality of materials to be used.

Roof extension

The proposed extension at roof level would form a mansard roof which is generally considered the most appropriate way to terminate a building without adding a highly visible roof. Camden Planning Guidance CPG1 states that roof extensions will only be permitted where they form part of an established form of roof addition; the alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of a building; and where there are a variety of roof additions and further development of a similar form would not be harmful.

The immediate locality has not been subject to roof addition. However, the area supports a mix of housing styles and heights which is predominately of three storeys. The pair of dwellings, under consideration, that mark the entrance to Fairfax Place are considered to form a uniform group. Design Guidance, CPG1, states that adding to a group as part of a co-ordinated design is unlikely to be acceptable. However, a roof extension to the pair of dwellings is not considered to be harmful to the skyline or surrounding streetscene which is varied and as such is acceptable in principle. To ensure that both roof extensions are completed around the same time their construction would need to be secured by a legal agreement if approved.

The height of the existing parapet is quite significant at approximately 1m. The proposed mansard roof would rise behind the existing parapet, separated by a suitable gutter, at an angle of 70 degrees. Internally, the headroom would be 2.3m. The front of the mansard would feature three suitably proportioned dormer windows that match the detailed design of the existing windows below and would have a minimal projection of 0.65m. The rear of the mansard would feature two dormer windows of similar design and projection. The roof would feature a single rooflight across the upper roofslopes which would provide additional daylight. The rooflight would not be visible from the public realm. The side of the roof extension would be terminated by a party wall which would protrude approximately 2.3m in height from the top of the existing parapet wall.

The form and detailed design of the proposed mansard roof is considered acceptable in relation to design guidance and would be an appropriate form of extension for the character and appearance of

the property and surrounding street-scene, in accordance with policies CS14 and DP24 of Camden's LDF.

Ground level extensions

Design guidance CPG1 states that rear ground level extensions are the most appropriate way to extend a property however, rear extensions that are inappropriately designed can spoil the appearance of a property or group of properties and harm the amenity of neighbouring properties. Generally, rear extensions should be designed to be: secondary to the host building; respect and preserve the original design, proportions and architectural features of the building; respect and preserve the historic pattern and townscape; allow for the retention of a reasonably sized garden and retain the existing open and natural character.

The rear garden of the application site is more representative of a yard, which is primarily formed of concrete, and is 2.6m to 4.5m in depth. A single storey splayed rear extension is proposed to the front of the yard, at its deepest part and would be stepped in its depth by 4.5m to an average of 1.3m which would allow for a reasonably sized outdoor area. The rear extension would feature a flat roof with parapet approximately 3.3m in height and would be fairly visible in the surrounding street-scene but would not appear at odds with the existing built environment which is characterised by garages at its rear and large double height rear projections opposite.

The ground level extension would feature French doors with fanlights at either side of the extension, which would maximise daylight and ventilation into the extended dining room. The proposed fenestration and materials at ground level would match the character and appearance of the existing building in accordance with design guidance and policies CS14 and DP24 of Camden's LDF.

The application site has an existing makeshift single storey side extension adjacent to the boundary of number 8, approximately 2.4m in height, which occupies the entirety of this area. The proposal would demolish the existing structure and rebuild to similar dimensions with a solid brick extension with flat roof, approximately 2.85m in height. A strip of high level glazing blocks would be sited on the side wall facing number 8 and would feature doors opening onto the rear garden.

In view that the proposed extensions would be subordinate to the scale and proportions of the host building and would match its design and materials as closely as possible it is considered acceptable in accordance with policies CS14 and DP24 of Camden's LDF.

Amenity

Development policy DP26 seeks to ensure that the amenities of existing and future occupiers are not unduly impacted by development.

It is not considered that the proposed rear and side extension would impact the amenities of adjoining neighbours in that the proposed extension would not provide direct overlooking into neighbouring habitable windows or be overly large so as to restrict outlook or daylight. The glazing blocks proposed in the side extension will be conditioned to ensure they remain fixed shut and obscurely glazed.

Corporate properties manage the neighbouring building adjacent, number 8, which is leased to Mind in Camden, a day centre. It has been requested that in addition to the way planning applications are conventionally assessed an assessment needs to be sufficiently flexible to consider them from the perspective of the day centre clients. Changes to the immediate environment and the encroachment of the adjacent property may be quite difficult for some of them to adjust to, and induce reactions of anxiety and stress. If the scheme is approved, it follows that noise and disruption from the works would need to be carefully managed, and specific activities restricted to certain times.

While a Construction Management Plan is not necessary for the works proposed, the applicant will be made aware of the sensitivities of the site adjacent with the need to work collaboratively in terms of construction and management.

Conclusion

The proposed mansard roof extension and single storey side and rear extensions are considered acceptable for the reasons outlined above in accordance with policies CS5; CS14; DP24 and DP26 of Camden's LDF.

Recommendation

Grant conditional permission subject to S106.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 21st January 2013.
For further information please click [here](#).