

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		29/05/2009	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		15/05/2009	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Bethany Arbery				2009/1734/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
4 Oak Hill Park Mews London NW3 7LH				Refer to draft decision notice.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of two-storey extension at rear ground and first floor level, installation of sliding rooflight at roof level and alterations to front first floor level balcony all in connection with existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Grant conditional permission.					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	09	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>A site notice was displayed from 24/04/09 to 15/05/09.</p> <p>Adjoining owners/occupiers The occupier of 8 Oak Hill Park Hill Mews had written in support of the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides a welcome lift to the front of this neglected terrace; • The rear extension will tidy up a dank rear area and reduce the length of a nasty passageway; and • The terrace lets down the rest of the mews and this type of high quality upgrade is welcome. 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		<p>Hampstead CAAC No objection.</p> <p>Local Groups No reply to date.</p>					

Site Description

Oak Hill Park Mews extends north-east off Oak Hill Park. At the northern end of the mews there is a block which comprises ground, first and second floor and provides 3 residential properties (Nos. 4-6). This application relates to No. 4 which is in use as a single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3). The building, which was designed by Lyell Associates, dates from the 1960s. The building is not listed, but it is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area. Nos. 1, 3, 4 and 7 Oak Hill Park Mews are referred to in the conservation area statement as properties which detract from the character of the area and would benefit from enhancement.

Relevant History

1 Oak Hill Park Mews

2007/5672/P

Planning permission was granted on 09/05/08 for the erection of a mansard roof extension to the existing house.

2 & 3 Oak Hill Park Mews

2003/3629/P

Planning permission was granted on 25/06/04 for conversion of roof space to provide additional accommodation for the existing houses, including the erection of a mansard roof extension to both properties.

4 Oak Hill Park Mews

CTP/E6/2/C/14156

Planning permission was granted on 02/11/72 for the provision of a roof terrace and sun lounge.

2008/5631/P

Planning permission was refused on 18/03/09 for the erection of two-storey extension at rear ground and first floor level, erection of roof extension over part of roof and installation of balustrading to remaining part of flat roof to create terrace, and alterations to front first floor level balcony.

4-6 Oak Hill Park Mews

2007/1885/P

Planning permission was refused on 03/07/07 for the erection of single-storey roof extension to provide additional living accommodation and roof terraces to the existing terrace of three dwellinghouses.

Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against. However, it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

London Borough of Camden adopted Unitary Development Plan 2006

- S1/S2 Sustainable Development
- SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
- H1 New housing
- B1 General design principles
- B3 Alterations and extensions
- B7 Conservation areas

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

In March 2009 planning permission was refused for the erection of an extension and balustrading (to create a terrace) at roof level and a two-storey extension to the rear of the application site. The roof extension and balustrading were considered to be unacceptable in principle. It was considered that the proposed roof extension and balustrading would have had an adverse impact on the architectural composition of the building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposed rear extension was considered to be acceptable in terms of its height, bulk and mass, but the detailed design was viewed to be unacceptable.

In response to this refusal an application has been made for a revised proposal. The proposed drawings indicate the following works to the property:

- erection of two-storey extension at rear ground and first floor level;
- installation of sliding rooflight on the main roof of the building;
- alterations to windows and doors on the front and rear elevation and the front first floor level balcony; and
- installation of decking adjacent to front entrance.

Permitted Development

It has not been possible to locate the original planning permission for this development to see if any conditions were imposed which removed permitted development rights. There is no record of any planning application having been granted or refused for alterations to windows and doors etc, but it is clear that many of the properties which form part of this development, have made changes to their windows and doors. It is therefore assumed that permitted development rights have not been removed from this single-family dwellinghouse. The proposal includes alterations to the windows and doors on the front and rear elevation. The existing powder-coated aluminium framed windows are to be replaced with windows of a similar material. The proposed alterations to the windows and doors are considered to permitted development by virtue of Class A, Part 1, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2008.

Similarly, the majority of the works to the first floor level balcony on the front elevation would be permitted development. The proposed works include replacement of the existing glazed panels with new obscure glazed panels, replacement of the stainless steel balustrading with new stainless steel balustrading and the addition of silver/grey powder coated sheets around the concrete base of the balcony. The proposed works do not enlarge the balcony, do not extend beyond a wall which is the principal elevation and fronts a highway, it is not for the construction or provision of a balcony (the wording of the GDPO suggests it is only referring to the installation of new balconies), but repair work an existing one. The replacement balustrading and panels, which are similar materials to existing are permitted development, the only element which would not be permitted development would be the metal cladding to the concrete base which fails condition A.2 (a) of Class A. Consideration is therefore given to this element in the design assessment.

The proposed decking which is located to the front of the house adjacent to the entrance door would also be permitted development. The decking does not extend beyond a principal wall which fronts a highway and does not have a height of more than 300mm (it is raised 200mm).

Design

The proposal includes only minor works at roof level. It is proposed to install a large sliding rooflight on the main roof of the building to light the staircase and landing. The rooflight projects 300mm off the main roof, less than the existing bathroom rooflight and the water tank. The proposed rooflight is obscured in views of the building by the parapet wall which rises 600mm above the height of the roof. Given that the proposed rooflight will not add additional height and bulk to the roof, which would be visible in views of the building, it is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

The property has a relatively small rear garden which backs onto a rear footpath which is accessible by all 3 properties. The proposal includes a rear extension to the property at ground and first floor level which extends over the footpath leaving only a small gap between the extension and the rear boundary wall. The proposed rear extension at ground and first floor level is quite large and in most cases would be unacceptable on a building of this scale, however, in this case it will be entirely concealed from public view due to the high level boundary wall immediately to the rear and therefore is considered to be acceptable in principle in design terms. The same view was taken on the application which was determined in March 2009.

The detailed design of the previously refused rear extension did not bare any relationship to the original building or that of buildings in the immediate area; the pitched rooflights were felt to be particularly incongruous. The applicant was advised that a simple design with a horizontal emphasis would be more appropriate for this

building. The current application includes a flat roofed extension with projecting, but flat, rooflights. The overall form of the extension is considered to be acceptable and more in keeping with the form of the original buildings, however, the proposed fenestration on the rear extension continues to have a vertical rather than a horizontal emphasis. The openings sit very close to the high rear boundary wall, thus they have been designed in the form of French doors in order to maximise the amount of light entering the new space. Whilst it would be preferable for the openings to match the design of those on the original building, given that they are totally obscured by the high level boundary wall and are not visible from any public or private vantage point they are considered to be acceptable.

The proposed cladding of the concrete base of the existing first floor level balcony is not considered desirable as the concrete balcony slabs are an original feature of the building. However, it is acknowledged that the concrete has deteriorated to such a level that it is disintegrating and cladding is necessary to ensure that falling pieces do not harm the occupants. It is considered that so long as the cladding is appropriately coloured/textured to minimise its visibility this is acceptable. It is recommended that a sample of the cladding be secured by condition before work starts on this part of the development.

Amenity

In accordance with Policy SD6 consideration must be given to the potential impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

The proposed rooflight would not impact on light, outlook or privacy to any of the neighbouring properties.

The proposed rear extension is confined below the height of the rear and side boundary walls. The only property which could be affected in terms of light and outlook would be No. 5. The height and depth of the extension would result in some loss of light and a heightened sense of enclosure to No.5. However, those windows affected serve non-habitable rooms and therefore this is considered to be acceptable. At ground floor level there is a window serving a kitchen, but this is positioned far enough east not to be affected. The first floor level windows serve a stairwell and bathroom. The proposed extension includes glazing in the side elevation, but this is confined to the rear section which is set away from the boundary with No. 5. It would not be possible to gain views into neighbouring windows from this glazing.

Recommendation: Grant conditional 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