

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	10/08/2010
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	06/08/2010
Officer			Application Number	
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2010/2658/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
Gondar House Gondar Gardens London NW6 1QG			See draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal				
Retention of alterations including installation of two rooflights on front roof slope, two rooflights on rear roof slope and new door on ground floor front elevation, as amendment to planning permission (ref: 2008/1414/P) granted on 13/11/2008 for (erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, and change of use of 2 self-contained flats to 3 self-contained residential units (1x 1-bed flat, 1x 1-bed maisonette and 1x 3-bed maisonette)).				
Recommendation:		Refuse Planning Permission and Warning of Enforcement Action		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	05	No. of responses	06	No. of objections	06
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The occupiers of 1 Hillfield Road, Flat 2 and Flat 3 1 Hillfield Road, 35 Hillfield Road, Flat 2 66 Hillfield Road and 42 Gondar Gardens objected to the proposal. In summary, the grounds of their objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The proposed door on the ground floor elevation detracts from the appearance and character of the building and does not in keeping with the rest of the properties on the same terrace and opposite terrace on Hillfield Road. It spoils the vista of Hillfield Road.• There would noise nuisance from the front door to the adjoining property on Hillfield Road.• The developers have already done the proposed works and additional works to the front garden including paving of the front garden, inappropriate boundary treatment and steps to the front doors (following removal of hedges).• The 2m fencing compromise the outlook from 1 Hillfield Road and daylight to the ground floor of that property.• The steps at the front entrance would intrude on the privacy of ground floor flat at 1 Hillfield Road as it would allow view to the living room of that property.• The stepped front entrance would not be suitable for disable access. The side door which has been filled in would be more appropriate for disabled users.• The applicant did not consult the neighbours and has no consideration of the neighbours. <p>Cllr Flick Rea supported the objection raised by the occupiers of 1 Hillfield Road and considered the proposal to be out of keeping with the area and the high fencing around the front garden to be an eyesore.</p> <p>Cllr Patricia Birch, Cllr Don Williams and resident Ms Jean Hornbuckle on Hillfield Road objected to the proposal. In summary, the grounds of their objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Change of window into a door on the front bay is out of keeping with the area.• General design of the development took place on the site does not in keeping with the previous planning permission and set as dangerous president in the area.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>Hillfield and Aldred Road's Residents Association (45 Hillfield Road) objected to the proposal and made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No objection to Velux windows but they could have been a little smaller.• Blocking up the side door and putting a new entrance through the front bay and front steps have a detrimental impact on the road.• The front steps are over 60cm and therefore they require a handrail. The front garden has been resurfaced. These works may require planning permission.• Hillfield Road suffered severe flooding several years ago due to excess run-off. The Council should be strict in enforcing sustainable drainage for development sin the area.• Steps should be removed and moving door from side to front should be refused.					

The Gondar and Agamemnon Residents Association objected to the application and requested that permission should be refused. In summary their concerns are:

- The insertion of a door into the bay window on the Hillfield Road elevation does not respect to the original design of the house and the rhythm of the street. Its detailing has no relation to its Victorian context.
- The applicant has a dismissive approach towards consulting neighbours and the community.

Site Description

The property is a 2-storey building converted into two flats on the corner of Gondar Gardens and Hillfield Road. It has two principal frontages. The property is neither listed nor within a conservation area.

There are ongoing construction works on the site and therefore the site is vacant. During the site visit on 19/07/2010 it was found that the alterations that this application seeks permission have already been completed in addition to other works of which the Council has no planning records.

Relevant History

Planning:

2007/4559/P - Planning permission was refused on 29/11/2007 for the extension at rear ground, first and second floor and change of use of the first and second floors from a 3-bedroom maisonette to 1 x 1-bedroom and 1 x 3-bedroom self-contained flats (Class C3). The application was refused on the following grounds:

- *"The proposed extension by reason of its height, bulk, mass and design would not be subordinate to the original building and would be unduly dominant in the street scene contrary to Policy B1 (General design principles) and B3 (Alterations and extensions) of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Camden Planning Guidance 2006."*
- *"The proposed window on the ground floor side elevation facing 1 Hillfield Road, by reason of its location would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking into the habitable room of the ground floor flat of 1 Hillfield Road contrary to policy SD6 (Amenity for occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and Camden Planning Guidance."*
- *"In the absence of a legal agreement to secure the development as car free, the proposed development would result in an unacceptable level of parking stress on the Fortune Green Controlled Parking Zone contrary to Policies T8 (Car free housing and car capped housing) and T9 (Impact on parking) of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 and the Camden Planning Guidance."*

2008/1414/P – Planning permission was granted on 13/11/2008 (subject to s106) for the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, and change of use of 2 self-contained flats to 3 self-contained residential units (1x 1-bed flat, 1x 1-bed maisonette and 1x 3-bed maisonette).

2010/0229/P – Planning application was withdrawn on 13/04/2010 for the installation of door to the front elevation of ground floor flat, as amendment to previously approved application 2008/1414/P. (Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension, and change of use of 2 self-contained flats to 3 self-contained residential units (1x 1-bed flat, 1x 1-bed maisonette and 1x 3-bed maisonette).)

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 – Amenity for Occupiers and Neighbours

B1 – General Design Principles

B3 - Alterations and Extensions

H7 - Lifetime Homes and wheelchair housing

H8 - Mix of units

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

As the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have now been published, they are material planning considerations. However, as a matter of law, limited weight should be attached to them at this stage.

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 – Providing quality homes
CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
DP5 – Housing size mix
DP6 – Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes
DP24 – Securing high quality design
DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Assessment

Proposal

It appears that the drawings submitted with this application are incorrect and do not correctly represent the existing development on the application site. The proposed and approved drawings are also labelled incorrectly. The approved drawing shows the details of the amendments and the proposed drawing shows the details of approved scheme.

According to the application form the following amendments are proposed to the approved scheme:

- The installation of roof lights to the front and rear roof slopes; and
- New door into the existing garden on the front elevation.

Additional works that have been carried out on site which require planning permission and are not included in this application are:

- Erection of wall and fencing around the front garden facing Gordon Gardens and Hillfield Road (as they exceed 1m in height and are adjacent to then highway).
- Raised platform and steps to the new door on the front bay on the front garden (as they are higher than 300mm).
- Hard surfacing of front garden (covering the entire garden and appearing not to be permeable).
- Erection of enclosure for refuse storage and meters behind the new side wall on Gondar Gardens on the front garden.

Design

Policy B3 of the adopted UDP states the Council will not grant planning permission for alterations and extensions that it considers harm to the architectural integrity of the existing building or to the surrounding area. Furthermore, consideration will be given to whether alterations and extensions are subordinate and sympathetic to the original building in terms of form, scale and materials.

New front door to ground floor flat: The original house is a Victorian property with a decorative frontage on Hillfield Road. It forms part of the terrace on the north side of Hillfield Road. That terrace of properties are characterised by front bays and recessed ground floor entrances. The new door in the centre of the front bay on the Hillfield elevation of the building is considered to be an unsympathetic alteration to the architectural style of the application building and detracts from the architectural rhythm of the building. That part of the scheme is contrary to policies B1 and B3 of the UDP.

Rooflights: The rooflights each measure 1m x 1m and do not protrude more than 150mm beyond the roof planes. They are positioned closer to the ridge line and do not significantly alter the front and rear elevations. The roof lights are considered to be acceptable in design terms as they do not harm the appearance of the building or the streetscape.

Other Alterations: The existing landscaping of the front garden including the hard surfacing, steps and raised platform are considered to have an adverse visual impact. Furthermore, the cumulative effect of the alterations to the front elevation and garden of the application property are considered to cause unacceptable harm to the appearance and character of the original building and the surrounding area. As such, the proposal is contrary to policies B1 and B3 of the adopted UDP and further advice given in the Council's planning guidance.

The approved window on the first floor level elevation of the rear addition has not been installed. This is considered to be a non-material amendment and does not significantly affect the overall design of the approved scheme.

Neighbour amenity

The alterations are not considered to raise any material amenity issues in terms of loss of daylight, outlook and

privacy and comply with policy SD6.

Although initial concerns raised by the adjoining neighbour regarding the loss of light and privacy due to the front entrance arrangement, the proposed door and steps are not considered to significantly worsen the impact when the front garden is in use by the occupiers of that property.

Standard of accommodation and mix of units

The proposed alterations do not affect the numbers of approved units and their floor areas in the property. The external alterations would still enable all the units to receive adequate natural light and ventilation. However it appears that there would a change on the approved mix. This consisted of 1x 1-bed flat, 1x 1-bed maisonette and 1x 3-bed maisonette. The proposed mix of units is 1x 1-bed flat, 1x 1-bed maisonette and 1x 2-bed maisonette. The first floor and second floor mezzanine (flat 3) would have an additional bathroom instead of a bedroom. Given the size of this mezzanine would still be 84m² and could easily be to altered to provide three bed unit which would accommodate up to 5 persons in accordance with the Council's standards, the revised scheme is still considered to comply with the aims of policy H8.

The proposed amendment to the ground floor entrance resulted in a stepped entrance from the street level to the front bay on the Hillfield elevation of the building which does not comply with Lifetime Homes standards. The original building had an entrance door on the Gondar Garden elevation with one small step. That side door removed and its opening is filled in. It is considered that the proposal has worsened the existing access arrangement for a disabled person.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613