

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		24/08/2012	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		09/08/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Gideon Whittingham				1) 2012/3415/P 2) 2012/3416/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
56 Rochester Road London NW1 9JG				Refer to draft decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
1) The erection of an additional floor on existing 3 storey rear closet wing extension up to main eaves height and replacement of existing 2 storey rear conservatory to provide additional accommodation to house (Class C3). 2) The erection of an additional floor on existing 3 storey rear closet wing extension up to main eaves height, replacement of existing 2 storey rear conservatory, erection of an additional floor on existing 2 storey side extension and erection of a roof level pyramidal loft extension to provide additional accommodation to house (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		1) Refuse Planning permission 2) Refuse Planning permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	1) 53 2) 43	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00	
			No. Electronic	00			
Summary of consultation responses:		1) A site notice was displayed from 13/07/2012 (expiring on 03/08/2012) and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from 19/07/2012 (expiring on 09/08/2012). 2) A site notice was displayed from 16/07/2012 (expiring on 09/08/2012) and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from 16/07/2012 (expiring on 06/08/2012). To date no representations have been received.					

CAAC/Local groups comments:

The Rochester CAAC were formally consulted. No response has been received to date.

Site Description

This application relates to a raised two-storey semi detached (with No.57 Rochester Road) dwellinghouse comprising basement, ground and first floor levels. The building is located on the South-West side of Rochester Road, within the Rochester Conservation Area.

The building is not listed but has been identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area in the Rochester Conservation Area Statement.

The predominant character of the surrounding area is, like the application site, residential in nature.

Relevant History

- H12/10/8/34620: Pp granted (05/10/1982) for the erection of a single storey bathroom extension at side first floor level. 05/10/1982
- 8802319 - Pp granted (06/09/1988) for the erection of a single storey bathroom extension at side at first floor level.
- 2011/0792/P – Pp granted (08/04/2011) for the erection of timber-framed two-storey conservatory at ground and first floor level following demolition of existing, to rear of single dwelling (Class C3)
- CA/2012/ENQ/03666 – pre application advice was sought in May 2012 for the erection of a single storey closet wing extension up to main eaves height located at rear first floor level, replacement of existing 2 storey rear conservatory located at rear basement floor level, the erection of a single storey side extension upon existing 2storey extension and roof level pyramid extension.
- 2012/3414/P - The erection of a single storey closet wing extension located at rear first floor level and replacement of existing 2 storey rear conservatory located at rear basement floor level (Class C3). This application is currently under consideration.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies:

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 (sections 4 and 5); CPG6 Amenity;

Rochester Conservation Area Statement 2001 (pages: 23-27)

London Plan 2011

NPPF 2012

Assessment

1. Proposal:

1.1 The applications both originally proposed:

- The replacement of an existing timber framed 2 storey infill conservatory, measuring approximately 4m (height) x 2.5m (width) x 2.4m (depth) with a metal framed 2 storey infill conservatory, measuring approximately 4m (height) x 2.5m (width) x 2.4m (depth).
- The erection of a single storey brick faced extension upon an existing 2 storey rear closet wing. The resulting closet wing external would rise to the existing main roof eaves height and internally feature four floor levels. The rear elevation would feature a single panel window. The flat roof would comprise a rooflight measuring 1.7m x1.7m.
- The erection of a single storey brick faced extension upon an existing 2 storey side extension. The resulting side extension would rise up to the existing main roof eaves height. The front and rear elevation would each feature a single panel full length window. The flat roof would comprise a rooflight measuring 2.1m x1.1m.
- The erection of a pyramid-shaped roof extension to the main roof. The structure would principally be glazed and set within the valley of the existing roof. The roof extension would rise approximately 0.9m above the front roof parapet.

1.2 The 1st application ref:[2012/3415](#) has, since submission, been amended removing:

- The single storey brick faced extension upon an existing 2 storey side extension

1.3 The main issues for consideration are:

- The impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the buildings and the surrounding conservation area and;
- The impact that the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

2. Impact of the extensions upon the host building and surrounding conservation area:

Conservatory:

2.4 With regard to the replacement 2 storey glazed infill conservatory, the principal of demolition and replacement, maintaining the same footprint and height whilst varying its design has been established in 2011 (see history, ref: 2011/0792/P). This application seeks again to replicate the same footprint, whilst altering the detailed design of the conservatory, by virtue of featuring fewer glazing bars and an altered roof pitch.

2.5 Guidance forming part of the Rochester conservation area statement states “*conservatories, as with extensions, should be small in scale and subordinate to the original building and at ground floor level only. The design, scale and materials should be sensitive to the special qualities of the property and not undermine the features of the original building. Conservatories at high level will not be permitted.*”

2.6 Within this context, there is a general presumption that a 2 storey infill conservatory would be resisted, by virtue of its terminating height, size and prevailing context, given that no such extension exists at No.57 Rochester Road. However, given that this proposal would essentially result in the detailed design alteration of an existing conservatory, the proposal is considered acceptable. The proposed framing materials and detailed design, when compared to the existing structure, are considered sympathetic to the character and appearance of the building.

2.7 The reconstruction of the foundations of the conservatory may affect the roots of three trees (a pear, an elder and a lime tree) located within influencing distance of the property, in adjoining gardens, and therefore an informative should be added to any decision to approve, advising the applicants that, given that the trees are within a conservation area, consent would be required if any

works to the trees are necessary in order to rebuild the conservatory, for instance if root works are required.

Closet wing extension:

2.4 The paired villa of No.57 Rochester Road features a three storey brick faced closet wing extension. Comprising basement, ground and first floor levels, the closet wing is brick faced and terminates below the main eaves. The host building currently features an existing 2 storey closet wing, approximately 1.2 metres below its neighbour at No.58 Rochester Road.

2.5 In most cases, there is a presumption that extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged. It is considered that extensions, particular closet wing extensions should be viewed as subordinate, by virtue of its height, size and bulk, to the original building.

2.6 When assessed against prevailing development, in particular the paired property of No.57, a matching closet wing extension, set below the main roof eaves, could aid in balancing the pair, whilst remaining consistent with the overall character, appearance and hierarchy of the main building. In this instance however, the proposal seeks a closet wing extension which would rise above the closet wing extension of No.57 and above the height of the main eaves of the host building. It is considered this particular element of terminating height above the main roof eaves would represent an unsympathetic and inappropriately designed extension, which would undermine the hierarchy of host building with its closet wing extension. The fenestration pattern is also unfortunate in that it does not match the window locations on lower floors. Given that the side extension would be the subject of clear and direct public and private views, the proposal would unduly dominate and unbalance the appearance of the host building, contrary to CPG1. In this context, the closet wing extension is considered unacceptable in bulk, height and detailed design in terms of its impact on the property, its neighbour and the conservation area.

Side extension:

2.7 The south-west side of Rochester Road comprises a relatively small group of buildings, comprising No.56-59(cons), set between single storey garages to the North-West and Rochester Mews to the South-East. The semi detached (paired) buildings of Nos. 58 and 59 are three storeys in height, comprising basement, ground, first and second floor levels, with recessed side extensions rising up to main eaves level. The neighbouring buildings of Nos. 56 and 57 (paired) are 2 storeys in height and feature side extensions rising up to ground floor level only. With such distinct differences between the pairings of Nos. 58-59 and Nos. 56-57, developments considered appropriate to one pair, may not be appropriate to the adjoining pair. In this instance, proposals such as side extensions permitted or implemented on Nos. 58 and 59 shall not guide future developments to Nos. 56 and 57.

2.8 In view of Nos. 56 and 57 only, both properties have side extensions which are considered to be appropriately balanced, by virtue of their matching height, bulk and recessed position which highlight the architectural symmetry and integrity of composition shared by Nos. 56 and 57.

2.9 Although permission has previously been granted in 1988 (ref: 8802319) for a similar side extension to the host property, given that this predates the adoption of all relevant policies forming part of the LDF (2011), CPG (2011) and Rochester Conservation Area Statement 2001, this shall not be given significant weight in consideration of the current proposal.

2.10 The erection of a single storey extension upon an existing 2 storey side extension, by virtue of its height, size and detailed design with its large blank window openings at both front and rear, would represent an unsympathetic extension which would imbalance the architectural symmetry and architectural composition shared by Nos. 56 and 57. Given that the side extension would be the subject of clear and direct public and private views, it is considered the enlarged side extension would no longer be perceived as subordinate, but rather would unduly dominate the host building, harming its character and appearance, its relationship with its neighbour and the character and appearance of the conservation area. In this context, the side extension is considered unacceptable.

Roof extension:

2.11 At main roof level, the host building features a double hipped roof, set behind a parapet wall to the front. The original roof has been the subject of few alterations other than modern day incidental elements such as arials and a rooflight. The adjoining building of No.57 also remains relatively unimpaired, other than infilling the original valley. As a result, both properties maintain a relative level of symmetry at roof level, in terms of their terminating height and lack of extensions or significant additions above the ridge and front parapet height.

2.12 Where mansard roofs are often the most appropriate form of extension at this level, this application proposes an atypical pyramidal shaped extension for the provision of an internal mezzanine floor above second floor level. Set 2.1m rearward of the front parapet, the roof extension would have a base of 14sqm and be substantially glazed.

2.13 With regard to LDF policy approach, respecting the local character is an intrinsic aim. In particular DP24 & DP25 require careful consideration of the characteristics of a site, features of local distinctiveness, and the wider context to be demonstrated in order to achieve high quality development which integrates into its surroundings. Within areas of distinctive character, it is considered development should reinforce those elements which create the character.

2.14 In consideration of guidance forming part of the Rochester Conservation Area Statement, roof extensions are likely to be unacceptable in the following circumstances:

- It would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building
- The property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely, but not necessarily completely, unimpaired
- The property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset
- The roof is prominent, particularly in long views

2.13 In terms of viewpoints, the front parapet would obscure some public views; however the lack of a parapet to the flank elevation would render the roof extension highly visible, the subject of clear and direct public views along Rochester Road and surrounding private views. It is considered that a roof extension of this design and extent of glazing would introduce an unsympathetic and incongruous addition, which would unbalance the architectural composition shared with the adjoining property of No.57 and harm the character and appearance of the host building. In this context, the roof extension is considered unacceptable and would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.

3. Neighbour amenity

3.1 It is considered that no undue harm would be caused with regard to the amenity of the neighbouring properties in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, visual bulk or sense of enclosure.

3.2 The proposed increase in height of the rear closet wing, by virtue of its extent, distance from No.57 and lack of fenestration to the flank elevation, would not result in a loss of sunlight/daylight nor would it present any increased sense of enclosure to the adjoining and surrounding properties.

3.3 Although the 'use' of the replacement conservatory would allow a degree of overlooking to a rear ground floor level flank window of No.57 Rochester Road, it is considered the proposal would be of no greater detriment to the privacy of the adjoining property than the existing conservatory's arrangement. Within this context, it is considered that no further harm would result.

3.4 Given the location, position and proximity of the side and roof extensions to the surrounding residential properties, neither development would harm the amenity levels enjoyed by the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

Recommendation:

- 1) Refuse Planning permission
- 2) 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