

<b>Delegated Report</b>	<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>20/03/2009</b>
	N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>13/3/2009</b>

<b>Officer</b>	<b>Application Number(s)</b>
Hugh Miller	2009/0669/P

<b>Application Address</b>	<b>Drawing Numbers</b>
31 Rochester Road Camden London NW1 9JJ	See decision notice

<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>

<b>Proposal(s)</b>
Erection of a two storey rear extension at lower ground and ground floor levels to enlarge accommodation to the existing flat and maisonette plus associated window alterations to side elevation.

<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	<b>Refuse</b>
<b>Application Type:</b>	<b>Full Planning Permission</b>
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>
<b>Informatives:</b>	

<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>20</b>	No. of responses	<b>05</b>	No. of objections	<b>05</b>
			No. Electronic	<b>02</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	Loss of privacy from steps and windows, loss of daylight and sunlight; increased noise nuisance; loss of garden area, exceeds permitted development allowance, unbalances pair of houses at 31 and 32 and harms the CA.; excessive height and width; excessive and intrusive development in conservation area; precedent set for future extensions.					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	Rochester CAAC query various design and dimension issues of scheme; raise concerns at overlooking, extra noise, scale within pd rights, extra scale and density by infilling gaps around house within CA.					

## Site Description

3 storey semidetached villa within Rochester conservation area. The property has a lower ground floor flat and a 2 storey maisonette above; at the rear is small closet wing containing WC's for both units. The pair of houses at 31 and 32 are symmetrical, but nearby terraces are different in their rear façade treatment with different types and depths of rear wings.

## Relevant History

none

## Relevant policies

### **RUDP 2006:**

SD6 –Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 –General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation areas

### **CPG 2006:**

Section 19-Extensions, alterations & conservatories:

Rochester CA Statement: R20 & R22.

## Assessment

The main issues are design, the impact on the appearance of the building and on the character and appearance of the C.A, and neighbour amenity.

The application proposes the following:

- ✓ *Erection of a two storey rear extension at lower ground and ground floor levels to enlarge accommodation to the existing residential units.*

## Design

The application building forms a pair of semi-detached properties (31-32) with shallow depth, 2-storey rear closet wings 1.2m depth x 2.5m width x 4.6m height. No. 33 is located to the west of the application site and are of identical design, height and footprint. The proposed extension would increase the depth, height and width of the closet wing with dimensions 4.0m depth x 4.7m width x 6.0m height. The extension would project beyond the side elevation of the building, be brought closer to the rear principal windows and project out 4m from the rear façade. It would have external staircase access to the garden for the upper floor unit.

The houses are symmetrical in terms of detailed design (hipped slate roof, timber doors, sliding timber sash windows with smaller proportioned timber sash windows, ornamented rails to upper ground window, and very small closet wings aligned vertically on the rear corners). It is considered that the extension destroys the symmetry and severely impacts on the appearance and integrity of the building. The proposed rear extension's width projects beyond the east flank wall and into the gap with no.29 as well as encroaching on the existing window at rear upper ground floor level; this would make it visually prominent and excessively out of proportion with the main house and harming the symmetry and integrity of both semi-detached properties. The design and materials in themselves are acceptable but the height, depth and width combine to give an excessively out of scale and bulky extension. It is considered therefore that the extension would detract from the appearance of the host building as well as its relationship with neighbours

East of the host building lies a pair of semi-detached houses nos. 29-30 with larger mono-pitch 2-storey rear closet wings. Nos. 23-28 have all been extended with even larger ones. However these cannot be considered to set a precedent and in any case they have been designed to better respect the form and proportions of main houses. Although the principle of extending the application property by a larger part 1 part 2 storey extension is acceptable, the proposed scheme is considered unacceptable in bulk and proportions.

Policy B3A justification states, para.3.31 *“Alterations and extensions can allow buildings to be enlarged, adapted and used more flexible. However, if poorly designed.... alterations and extensions can cause harm to the appearance of a building and the character of the surrounding area. It also states, ...Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations or extensions”*. Para. 3.32, states *“Extensions should be carefully sited and proportioned to respect the historic form of the area, the integrity and proportions of the original building.... Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions”*. Para. 3.32 continued, *... insensitive extensions can be a problem, for example, ..... a rear extension to a property in an otherwise unspoilt group, which detract from the uniformity of the rear elevation”*.

On the basis of the above, the proposed extension would:

- further obscure the original rear elevational arrangement, detracting from its appearance
- diminish the symmetrical detailed design of the buildings
- be excessively bulky and would not be subordinate to the host buildings,
- become visually dominant, conflicting with the appearance and character of the rear elevation. It is clear therefore, that the proposal would not be a subsidiary element and it would not be in compliance with policy B3A or CPG rear extension guidelines and is unacceptable.
- by its inappropriate design, scale and proportion, it would also harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and is contrary to policy B7.

The proposed extension would not be in compliance with CA Statement, specifically R20 and R22. The extension would not be in harmony with the original form and character of the houses, the uniform rear elevation would be spoilt, neither would it be subordinate to the original buildings.

#### Neighbour amenity

The proposed extension would not cause harm through loss of privacy as the side windows at lower ground floor would not afford views into neighbouring windows and the staircase would only be used for garden access. It would not impact on occupiers' amenity through loss of sun/daylight or outlook to adjacent habitable rooms. The proposal would accord with policy SD6.

Refusal is recommended.

### **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***