

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		05/12/2011	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		04/11/2011	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
David Glasgow				2011/4686/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
2 Hadley Street London NW1 8SS				Refer Draft Decision Notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of rear & side additions at ground, first and second floor levels to a single dwelling house (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	05	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	01
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>The occupiers of four adjoining properties were notified of the proposal in writing.</p> <p>The occupiers of No's 6 and 16 Hadley Street wrote in support of the application.</p> <p>The occupier of 51 Prince of Wales Road objected to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have not been notified of this application despite being immediate neighbours. The garden of 2 Hadley Street is overgrown to such an extent that it has a tree growing out of a wall that has forced the collapse of our own rear extension and placed our garden/yard in a perpetual state of near darkness. We have been plagued by vermin and this been reported to Environmental Health since 2006. The owner of 2 Hadley Street has taken no action to remedy the above. We consider that an extension of any description will further impact on our property and the likelihood of a part-finished structure sitting there for many years within what is already a semi-derelict property must be high. <p>Officer Comment: A notification letter was sent to 51 Prince of Wales Road on 14th October 2011. The current state of the property is subject to an enforcement investigation (Ref: EN09/0538) however this is not a material consideration of the current application.</p>					

CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	N/A

Site Description

The application site relates to a two-storey mid-terrace single dwelling house located on the west side of Hadley Street. The property is not listed and does not fall within a conservation area. Houses in the terrace benefit from a variety of extensions including mansard roof extensions and rear single storey infill and half width first floor rear extensions. The subject property is in a state of disrepair.

Relevant History

9201330 - Erection of a single storey rear extension and a rear extension at second floor level to the existing dwelling house. Refused 18/02/1993 ref: TAPP/X5210/A92/217138/P7

9200207 - Erection of a single storey rear extension a rear extension at second floor level and a roof extension to the existing dwelling house. Refused 21/05/1992. allowed on appeal

EN09/0538 - Enforcement case in relation to untidy land. Ongoing investigation.

2010/3584/P - Erection of mansard roof extension with a rear balcony to a single family dwelling house (Class C3). Granted 02/09/2010.

2011/2569/P - Erection of a 3 storey rear extension to existing house (Class C3). Withdrawn by applicant 19/07/2011.

Relevant policies

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 2011

Assessment

Proposal

It is proposed to erect a part single, part two and part three storey rear extension spanning the full width of the property at first floor level infilling the space between the existing closet wing and the southern property boundary and wrapping around the end of the existing closet wing at ground floor level. The first floor element would have a height of 4.5m on the boundary projecting 3.7m rearward. The extension would then step down in height to 3.5m for a distance of 1.2m, finally sloping down to a height of 2.5m at a finished distance 6.7m from the rear building line. The third storey element would have an angled mansard type profile and extend 3.5m across more than half the width of the building, with a height of 8.0m on the northern property boundary.

The property benefits from planning permission (Ref: 2010/3584/P) for a mansard roof extension. Although not shown on the submitted plans the mansard is shown on drawings in the applicant's design and access statement.

Design

DP24 states that the Council will require all development (including alterations and extensions to existing buildings) to be of the highest standard of design and will expect development to consider the character,

setting, context, form and scale of neighbouring buildings and the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed.

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) states that alterations should take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings. The proposed extension is considered to be unacceptable and would be contrary to policies DP24 and CPG. Specifically, the proposed rear extension is not in compliance for reasons as follows:

- a) it would not be subordinate to the building in terms of form, scale and proportions;
- b) it would not respect the original design and proportions of the building;
- c) it would not respect the historic pattern and established grain of the surrounding area;

The proposed extension would be three storeys in total with the second storey spanning the full width of the property and the third storey angled across over half the property and rising awkwardly above the eaves of the existing valley roof. These different elements of the extension do not relate visually to one another or the host building, resulting in a visually incongruous juxtaposition of edges and surface planes which pay no respect to the original form, scale or character of the host building.

The CPG states specifically those 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. The second floor element of the extension would rise above the eaves of the existing butterfly roof spoiling the appearance of this roof feature and the composition of the rear elevation. Even taking into account the approved mansard roof extension (which the applicant has not shown on the submitted plans) the extension at second floor level would still project half a storey above the lower eaves, the result being equally as harmful to the character of the host building.

With the exception of mansard roofs, there are no examples of three-storey rear extensions elsewhere in the terrace. Neither are there other examples of full width extensions at first floor level. In general, the pattern of development along the rear of the terrace is for one and two storey closet wing extensions and mansard roof extensions. The height, proportions and massing of the proposed extension, as well as causing demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the host building, would also fail to respect the pattern of local development appearing incongruous and out of keeping in the terrace.

The applicant sites a previous 1992 application at the site (Ref: 9201330 allowed on appeal Ref: TAPP/X5210/A92/217138/P7) as justification for the current scheme. This previous decision is not considered to be especially relevant to the current application due to fundamental differences between the schemes and the fact that it was decided under superseded policy. The current scheme is larger and considered significantly more harmful in terms of its impact on the character of the building and the amenity of the neighbouring property to the south. Unlike the current scheme, the previously approved scheme although large, respected the existing vertical rhythm of the rear elevation and being full width at ground floor level only, did not result in overshadowing and sense of enclosure to the neighbouring property to the south.

Of relevance to this application however are the inspector's comments that *'although the site is not in a Conservation Area and the building is not listed but development in Hadley Street, originally railway workers cottages, is not without townscape merit. The fact that most of it would not be generally seen and that the site is backed by a high railway viaduct does not excuse unacceptable development.'* The rear of the terrace is clearly visible from the railway line to the rear which is considered a significant view from the public realm. It is considered that due to the proposed scale, proportions and detailed design of the proposed extension that demonstrable harm would be caused to the character and appearance of the host building, the wider terrace and the area generally contrary to DP24 and CPG.

Amenity

Paragraph 6.20 of CPG refers to the *'Building Research Establishment (BRE). Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice'* to assess the impacts of sunlight and daylight. The BRE guidelines prescribe the 45 degree angle test which delineates areas into which extensions should not encroach to avoid restricting sunlight and daylight.

No.4 Hadley Street to the south of the subject site has a habitable room opening set back 1.5m from the shared boundary. Due to its excessive height and depth on the boundary the proposed extension would encroach into

the protected 45 degree angle measured (in the horizontal plane) from the mid point of this opening and also into the 45 degree angle measured in the vertical plane. Failing this test the extension would significantly reduce daylight to this ground floor habitable room.

The height and depth of the proposed extension on the southern boundary of between 4.0m and 5.0m in height (including ground level difference) for a distance of 5.0m is considered excessive and to result in a harmful sense of enclosure to No.4 which is presently enclosed to the south by the two storey closet wing of No.6 Hadley Street and to the rear by the high wall of the railway viaduct. The proposed extension would effectively block the only respite for this neighbouring garden in terms of daylight and outlook. It is considered that the resulting loss of daylight and increased sense of enclosure would cause demonstrable harm to the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers contrary to CPG and DP26.

No. 51 Prince of Wales Road to the north of the site contains an upper floor bedroom window at second floor level approximately 1.5m from the shared boundary with the subject site. The third storey element of the proposed extension would extend the existing boundary wall adjacent to this window by an additional 1.0m for a distance of 3.0m. As a result the extension would fail the 45 degree angle test (vertically and horizontally) overshadowing this window, resulting in a significant loss of sunlight and daylight and causing demonstrable harm to the amenity of neighbouring occupants of this property contrary to CPG and DP26.

Privacy

The proposal will have no impact on the privacy of neighbouring properties.

Other matters

The owner of the property has submitted a letter of support citing various examples of extensions as justification of the current proposal. These being at Nos. 16, 17, 18, 26 and 60 Hadley Street. None of these examples are considered comparable to the current proposal however for clarity they are addressed as follows:

16 Hadley Street- 2011/3210/P – This application involved the replacement of existing railings above a rear two storey extension and not the building up of the parapet wall as stated by the applicant. The replacement railings had no impact on the sunlight, daylight privacy or outlook of the neighbouring property.

17 Hadley Street - 2011/4148/P – This application involved the erection of a mansard roof and not the retention of an existing balcony as stated by the applicant. This application is not comparable to the current proposal.

26 Hadley Street - 2007/4771/P – This application involved a single storey rear infill extension which is not comparable to the proposed part single, two and three storey extension at the subject site.

18 Hadley Street - 2010/0955/P - This application involved a single storey rear infill extension which resulted in an increased height on the shared boundary of 0.4m. This was not considered to result in a material reduction of daylight or outlook to the neighbouring property which was already heavily restricted by an existing 2.2m boundary wall.

60 Hadley Street - 2008/2613/P - This application involved the building of the side wall of an existing two-storey rear extension by 1.0m. This was considered acceptable as the existing two storey rear extension already completely restricted sunlight, daylight and outlook to the adjoining neighbouring windows. The small increase in height would not have resulted in additional harm.

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