

Delegated Report Members Briefing		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		26/11/2012	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		22/11/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Philip Niesing				2012/5025/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
14 Maryon Mews London NW3 2PU				Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Retention of revisions to roof profile, materials and height of single storey extension, revisions to window at first floor level and changes to size and location of rooflights as an amendment to 20011/5377/P dated 03/01/2012 for the erection of extension at side (south) ground floor level with part sloping glazed roof above, extension at side first floor level, and installation of three rooflights into existing roofslope, new double doors at ground floor level to west elevation and new window at first floor level to side elevation to dwelling house (Class C3).							
Recommendation:		Grant Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	6	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site Notice 24/10/2012 until 14/11/2012 Press Notice 01/11/2012 until 22/11/2012 Letters were received from the occupiers of neighbouring properties at 31 and 33 Pond Street and 13 Maryon Mews, objecting to the proposal on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The flat roof is unsympathetic to the original design of the house; - The parapets of the extension are too high and not in keeping with the rest of the house; - The enlarged south facing window causes overlooking and loss of privacy; and - The flat roof can potentially be used as a roof terrace in the future. (Officers comments: The above matters have been addressed in sections 3 (Design and appearance) and 4 (Amenity) of this report.)					

CAAC/Local groups comments:

Hampstead CAAC **objected** for the following reason:

'We are concerned about the constriction of the window of the adjoining property, which will abut a blank wall of the side of the new extension. We have no objection to the principle of the works, but feel this aspect should be reviewed. The drawings are inconsistent in their description.'

(Officers comments: See paragraph 4.3 of this report)

Site Description

The application site is a two-storey mews style residential property situated to the south corner of Maryon Mews, which lies west of Hampstead Heath Station. This is a modern estate of mews houses designed by Ted Levy in the 1970s. It has a distinct well preserved character and feel to it. The entrance to the site is visible from South End Road and is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area. It is not listed in the Conservation Area Statement as a building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

Relevant History

2009/1439/P Alterations at roof level including installation of dormer windows, roof lights and a solar panel to provide additional floor space to dwelling (Class C3). **Refused** on 12/06/2009.

2007/0169/P (Application for a Lawful Development Certificate) Erection of railings around the flat roof of the existing single storey extension to the rear of the dwellinghouse, plus replacement of a window with doors to facilitate the creation of a roof terrace. **Refused** on 06/03/2007

2011/5377/P Extension at side (south) ground floor level with part sloping glazed roof above, extension at side first floor level, installation of three rooflights into existing roofslope, including alterations to create new double doors at ground floor level to west elevation, and new window at first floor level to side elevation to dwelling house (Class C3). **Granted** on 03/01/2012

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies, 2010

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity)

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP23 (Water)

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)

Hampstead conservation area statement, 2001

NPPF, 2012

London Plan, 2011

Assessment

1. Overview and proposal

1.1 Retrospective planning permission is sought for amendments to the ground and first floor rear extensions which received planning permission on 03/01/2012, ref. 2011/5377/P. This is a full planning application, as the proposed changes can not be considered minor or non-material amendments. The proposed changes include:

- The omission of the glazed walls and roof to the proposed ground floor extension and its replacement with a flat roof with raised brick parapet walls and flat glass roof light;
- Changes to the fenestration at ground and first floor level; and
- The omission of an approved rooflight in main roof and changes to the sizes of the rooflights.
-

2. Amendments

- 2.1 During the course of this application the drawings have been revised to include a green/brown roof above the proposed rear extension.

3. Design and appearance

- 3.1 The proposal is for a brick rear extension that matches the materials of the host building, rather than the approved conservatory style part brick/part glazed extension. Notwithstanding the changes to the detailed design of the approved extension, the footprint remains essentially the same, projecting 1.75m (instead of 2.1m) from the southern flank wall. The proposal is for a (flat) green roof over the ground floor extension with a maximum parapet height of 3.4m measured from the lower terrace (first 950mm) and 2.25m measured from the higher terrace (The rear garden, owing to a rise in ground levels towards the south consist of a number of raised terraces).
- 3.2 Notwithstanding the changes to the roof and the finishing materials, the proposed extensions would remain subservient in appearance to the main dwellinghouse, and would, as a result of the matching brickwork, integrate within the character and appearance of the host building and the surrounding Conservation Area. The proposed flat roof with parapet wall is in keeping with an existing single storey west wing. The proposed changes to the fenestration, including the rear first window and rooflights are also considered acceptable in design terms.

4. Amenity

- 4.1 The proposal involves the enlargement of an approved first floor opening in the rear elevation at first floor level, from a 1200mm x 850mm window opening to a 1200mm x 1200mm opening.
- 4.2 *Overlooking loss of privacy:* The objections raised by the neighbouring properties relating to overlooking and loss of privacy are duly noted in this respect. However, although some additional *perceived* overlooking would result from the enlarged opening, it is not considered that this change would have such a material affect the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the adjoining properties to warrant refusal of permission. The back to back distance between the application site and the properties along Pond Street is some 30 metres and the application site lies at a significantly lower level than those properties. Whilst the window is wider than as approved (1.2m compared to 0.85m as approved) it will not be any closer to the boundary with No. 13 Maryon Mews. Given the separation, the change in levels and matured vegetation along the southern boundary of the site it is not considered that the proposals, particularly the first floor window and rooflights, would adversely impact the amenities enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring houses in terms of *actual* overlooking and loss of privacy.
- 4.3 *Loss of daylight/sunlight and outlook:* The orientation of the site relative to the neighbouring properties and the bulk and locations of the proposed extensions would mean that no material harm in terms of overshadowing or loss of outlook would occur. The comments made by the CAAC in this respect referring to the *constriction of the window of the adjoining property* is noted, but the relationship between this window and the rear addition has been established under 2012/5377/P. It is also not considered that the proposed changes to the rear extension would not have such a material impact on the occupiers of number 13 that would warrant refusal of permission.

5. Recommendation

- 5.1 Grant planning permission

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 26th November 2012.
For further information please click [here](#).