

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		07/11/2012	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		25/10/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Rachel Miller				2012/4771/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
38 South Hill Park London NW3 2SJ				Site Location Plan; Drawing No(s) 12018/10/102, 12018/00/100, 12018/10/103			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a single storey rear extension with glass balustrade at upper ground floor level to dwelling house (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	02	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		Site Notice expires 18/10/12 Press notice expires 25/10/12 1 letter of support received					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		South Hill Park CAAC – no response					

Site Description

The site contains a basement, 3-storey plus attic, mid-terrace building situated on the north-west side of South Hill Park. It forms part of a short terrace of 4 properties (nos. 36-42). The building is faced with brickwork with white stucco details and has a full width lower ground floor rear extension.

The building is in South Hill Park CA and backs onto Hampstead Ponds. Uninterrupted views are possible of the rear elevations of the whole of this side of the road from the Heath across the ponds. The building is not listed. The application building has been identified as a building that makes a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the area.

Relevant History

July 1991 – Pp granted - Demolition of existing ground floor rear extension and bay window in connection with the formation of a terrace, (ref. 9160034)

July 1991 – Pp granted - Alterations including the rebuilding of the bay window at rear ground floor level and the formation of a terrace to the existing dwelling house, (ref. 9100293.)

April 2001 – Pp refused - Erection of 2 dormer windows and 2 rooflights at both front and rear, and alteration to the front basement lightwell, (ref. PWX0002920). September 2001 - Appeal dismissed.

May 2001 – Pp granted - Erection of dormer window and 1 rooflight to the rear slope and 2 rooflights to the front roof slope, together with alterations to the front basement lightwell, (ref. PWX0103137.)

March 2010 – Pp refused - Erection of a single storey ground floor extension to rear of dwelling (Class C3). Reason for refusal - the proposed upper ground floor rear extension by reason of its inappropriate design and scale and removal of existing bay window would detract from the architectural integrity of the building, the consistent rhythm of the group of buildings to which it forms a part and to the character and appearance of the South Hill Park Conservation Area, contrary to policies B1 (General design principles), B3 (Alterations and extensions) and B7 (Conservation Areas) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006. (ref.2009/5864/P).

July 2012 – Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed) Replacement of bay window with sliding windows at rear ground floor (Class C3). Approved. (ref. 2012/2822/P).

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of Growth);
CS5 (Manage impact of growth);
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)

South Hill Park Conservation Area Statement 2001 – pages 15, 21

Camden Planning Guidance 2011 – sections 4.1- 4.15

NPPF - 2012

Assessment

The Applicant seeks consent to erect a single storey upper ground floor extension to the rear of the dwelling (Class C3).

The proposals involve the extension of the internal ground floor area onto the existing rear terrace of the house. The extension would be the full width of the house and have a depth of 2.4metres. It would have a pitched roof with a height of 3metres at the host building, sloping down to 2.5metres high. The extension would have a small terrace in front of it with a glass balustrade. The extension would be fully glazed with a lead seamed roof.

The main issues are: 1) the design of the extension and the impact on the appearance of the building and on the character and appearance of the conservation area 2) the impact on amenity for adjacent occupiers.

Design

With the exception of the host building and no.36, 2-storey bay-windows at the rear, basement and upper ground floor levels are characteristic of the terrace of 4 properties 36-42 and also nos.44 -46. As noted above (planning history), the host building had its bay window at the basement level removed and replaced with a flat roofed single-storey extension and the provision of a roof terrace.

The previous refusal for a full width upper ground floor extension in 2010 considered that it would be unacceptable to lose the attractive canted bay window at upper floor level which is characteristic of the host and neighbouring buildings. A certificate of lawfulness was granted in 2012 to remove the bay window and replace it with glazed sliding doors therefore the Applicant can remove the bay window under permitted development.

This application differs to the 2009 application in terms of the depth of the extension and provision of a balcony. In 2009, the depth of the proposed extension was the same as the lower ground floor extension (3metres from the host building). The Applicant now seeks to set the extension back by 0.7metres, to have a dept of 2.3metres. This does not however alter the fact that the extension would be the full width of the house. The width of the proposed extension, together with the cumulative impact of the existing full width lower ground floor extension would not be subordinate to the main house and would appear overly bulky in relation to the building itself and the group within the terrace. This would harm the consistent rhythm of the upper ground floor façade of the terrace due to its location, size, height and setting.

Additionally, the host building is visually prominent from the public realm, the Heath and Hampstead Pond No.1 that lies due north west of the site. Although a large proportion of the extension would be glazed, it nevertheless would have a visual dominance on the appearance of the host building when viewed from the Heath. It is therefore considered that the proposed extension, in its uncharacteristic, glazed appearance appear inharmonious and appear out of character with host building and the remainder of the terrace.

Paragraph 24.13 of Development Policies says that extensions that are overly large can disfigure a building. *“Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation.”*

The Conservation Area Statement (CAS) states, *...“some extensions have harmed the appearance of the Conservation Area and would no longer be considered acceptable. Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached, that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced”*. (SHP 18).

The Conservation Area Statement (CAS) states, *“... There are some sensitive cases where no extension or further extension can be permitted; in particular, properties that back onto Hampstead Heath that are included within the Article 4 Direction”*. (SHP20).

For the reasons stated above, the works would result in the harm to the historic character and appearance of the terrace and thus the Conservation Area contrary to policies DP25 and DP26 and CPG guidelines on rear extensions.

Amenity

No.36 South Hill Park lies due south-west of the application site and contains a 2-storey rear extension which forms an existing common party wall with the application building. The proposed extension would not cause harm through overlooking/ loss of privacy, loss of day/sunlight or impact on outlook and is satisfactory.

No.40 South Hill Park, which lies north-east of the application site, has no rear extension at upper ground floor level. It has an existing party wall which projects approximately 3metres from the rear elevation of the main building and measures 2.7m in height. Although the proposed extension would include an increase in the height of the common boundary wall by approximately 0.8metres the extension would not harm the amenity of the occupiers of number 40 South Hill Park. The windows on the rear elevation of the property is orientated due north-west and the extension overall depth and height would not impact detrimentally on the neighbour occupiers' amenity through overlooking/ loss of privacy, loss of day/sunlight or impact on outlook and sense of enclosure. The proposed is in compliance with policy DP26.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444