

**DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 25<sup>th</sup> February 2008. For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>16/01/2008</b>
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>13/12/2007</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Victoria Lewis			2007/5935/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
30 Christchurch Hill London NW3 1JL			See decision.	
<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 ground and 1 <sup>st</sup> floor side/rear extension, ground floor rear extension, enlarged hipped roof with new rear dormer window, and general remodelling to rear elevation.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	05	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	04
			No. Electronic	04		
Summary of consultation responses:	4 representations have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:					
	The replacement of the front windows would fail to preserve the architectural features of the building – officer response - The building is not listed or subject to an article 4 direction therefore this is permitted development by virtue of Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A (e) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. The replacement of the windows has therefore been removed from the plans.					
	The proposed increase in the height of the roof would result in a top-heavy appearance – officer response – The ridge height would not be increased significantly and would be acceptable in relation to the properties either side. The overall roof form to the rear elevation would be simplified.					
	The use of render at the rear and steel framed windows is inappropriate – officer response – this is permitted development by virtue of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 and references to this have therefore been removed from the plans.					
	Inaccuracies in the design and access statement with regard to 28 Christchurch Hill – officer response – a site visit to 28 Christchurch Hill has enabled an assessment of the potential impact upon this property.					
	Possible water run-off and damp arising from single-storey rear extension and concerns regarding the detailed method of construction – officer response – these issues are dealt with separately under the Building Regulations.					
	Increased overlooking from the enlarged dormer window – officer response – Although wide (5 window panes), two of the panes would serve a staircase, another would have an internal insulated panel preventing views outside and only two would have clear views out. This is not significant above and beyond the existing situation. There would be no direct views into 28 Christchurch Hill.					
	The proposed first floor side extension would result in a cramped form of development by infilling a natural space in the streetscene – officer response – a gap of 3.1m between the proposed extension and the flank wall of 32 Christchurch Hill would ensure the development would not appear cramped.					
	Render to the front elevation of the side extension would be out of keeping – officer response – the front elevation would be faced with brick, to match existing.					

	<p>Impact upon trees at Providence Corner (house which has a large rear garden backing onto the site) – <u>officer response</u> – <i>proposals to rebuild the existing rear boundary wall and increase its height to 3m have been omitted.</i></p>
<p><b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify</p>	<p><u>The Heath and Hampstead Society</u> has commented as follows:</p> <p>This is a dreadful example of bad layout, bad architecture and disregard of neighbours' interests. Concerns are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gross over development of a tiny site, destroying what little garden space there is and replacing it with a courtyard – <u>officer response</u> – <i>the existing rear garden is in shadow and has a number of level changes. The proposed works would result in more useable amenity space and would not result in a significantly smaller amount of garden space.</i></li> <li>2. Extension up to the boundary lines with intrusion at two levels into neighbours privacy, especially from the first floor terrace which would overlook number 32 – <u>officer response</u> – <i>the extensions would remain subservient to the original dwelling. A condition for a privacy screen would prevent overlooking of 32 Christchurch Hill.</i></li> <li>3. Outrageous replacement of windows and insertion of new, inappropriate windows which would destroy the architectural character of the building which is identified as a positive contributor within the conservation area – <u>officer response</u> – <i>this is permitted development.</i></li> </ol> <p><u>Hampstead CAAC</u> has objected to the proposal for the following reasons:</p> <p>Gross over-development of the site and as the extensions would exceed 10% of the cubic content of the existing house, no part of the application should be ranked as permitted development – <u>officer response</u> – replacement of the windows and rendering of the rear elevation are permitted development therefore there is no scope to control this. The proposal would not result in a significantly smaller garden than is currently the case.</p> <p>The rear dormer is already excessive in size in relation to the roof and is drawn incorrectly on the plans – <u>officer response</u> – the floor plans and elevation show the dormer would measure 4.6m wide. Although large, it would remain subservient within the roofspace. There is a large dormer at the rear of 28 Christchurch Hill.</p> <p>The glazed roof to the ground floor living room and two windows the first floor living room would result in light pollution – <u>officer response</u> – no significant light pollution would occur.</p> <p>The proposed window replacements are in clear breach of policy B7 in harming the front elevation and there by the conservation area – <u>officer response</u> – this is permitted development.</p>

### Site Description

2-storey 1930s brick built house located on the north-eastern side of Christchurch Hill, Hampstead. There is a flat-roof double garage attached to the side of the house, one half of which belongs to 32 Christchurch Hill. The garage for number 30 projects a maximum of 3.2m forward of the front elevation of the main building. There is a timber shed on the roof of the garage and a substantial annex type structure behind this which is accessed from the rear of the garage.

The site forms part of the Hampstead Conservation Area and is recognised as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

### Relevant History

2003/2452/P - The erection of a rear extension to provide additional habitable accommodation for a single family dwelling house – GRANTED.

2007/4666/P - Erection of a side and rear extension, enlarged rear dormer window, fenestration and general remodelling – this application was WITHDRAWN following concerns regarding the size and design of the first floor side extension, impact of the rear extension on 28 Christchurch Hill and the size of the rear dormer.

### Relevant policies

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours  
B1 – General design principles  
B3 – Alterations and extensions  
B7 – Conservation areas  
N8 – Ancient woodlands and trees  
Camden Planning Guidance 2006  
Hampstead Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

### Overview

Planning permission is sought for the following:

1. Single-storey extension at the side / rear of the property at ground floor level. This would be behind the existing garages and would extend up to the side and rear boundaries of the site and would have a flat, partially glazed roof.
2. First floor extension to the side of the building, on top of the flat roofed garage. It would have a flat roof and would measure a maximum of 3.3m wide and 6.4m deep, lining up with the rear elevation of the original building. The plans have been amended so that it would be set back 0.5m from the front elevation of the original house and to reduce the size of a pair of doors in its front elevation. The front and side elevations would be faced with matching brick and the rear elevation would be rendered. There would be direct access from this extension onto the flat roof of the garage which would be used as a terrace.
3. Single-storey flat-roofed extension on the boundary with 28 Christchurch Hill. It would measure 2.4m wide, 2.4m deep and 2.5m high and would be rendered.
4. First floor rear extension, increasing the depth of the first floor on the boundary with 28 Christchurch Hill by 1m., in association with the new enlarged hipped roof.
5. Remodelling of the roof to create a symmetrical hipped roof with a wider dormer at the rear. The ridge height would be increased by approximately 300mm and the dormer would measure 3m wide, 1.5m high and 1.3m deep; materials to match existing.

The proposals would involve partial demolition of the existing rear extensions and reinstating the rear wall in its original position.

### Revisions

The following revisions have been made to the scheme:

- Setting the first floor side extension back 0.5m from the front elevation of the original dwelling;
- Reduction in the size of the front window to the first floor side extension;
- Alterations to the remodelling of the roof to reduce the overall height increase;
- Omission of a new pedestrian entrance off Christchurch Hill.
- Removal of references to replacement of windows and rendering of rear elevation, as these are permitted development.
- Omission of details relating to rebuilding and increasing the height of the rear boundary wall.

### Design

The single-storey side / rear extension closest to 32 Christchurch Hill would not be visible from the public realm, being hidden behind the front garages, and would have no impact upon the appearance of the building. The existing raised garden in this location would be replaced by a new terrace above it. The existing single storey rear extension would be removed and the rear elevation remodelled to provide an equivalent amount of rear garden- the existing one is currently not particularly valuable being in shadow and very enclosed. The

single-storey rear extension adjoining no.28 would not be visible from the public realm and would appear subservient in relation to the original building.

With regard to the first floor side extension, extensions higher than portico level and rising up to eaves level are generally discouraged. However, in this instance, because the garage stands forward of the front elevation and because there is already an annex type structure on its roof, albeit set well back, the proposed first floor extension to the side of the building is considered to be acceptable. As revised, it would be set back half a metre from the front elevation of the original house, would be faced with matching brick and would retain a minimum of a 3 metre gap to the flank wall of 32 Christchurch Hill.

This proposed first floor extension would result in a more tidy appearance to the rear elevation, which is currently of varying depths owing to a number of extensions at the rear. There are no objections on design grounds to this element of the proposal.

The proposed remodelling of the roof would improve access to and size of the existing accommodation in the roofspace. The proposed increase in the ridge height would not be significant and, although it results in a larger roof, would be acceptable in relation to the heights of the buildings either side which step up the hill; the enlarged form is also acceptable in relation to adjoining buildings which differ in style between traditional Victorian and plain 1960's. The proposed dormer is very wide but is not unreasonable in the context of the remodelled rear facade and the large roof extension next door at 28. The dormer would be set 300mm down from the roof ridge, and whilst Camden Planning Guidance recommends 500mm, the set down is considered sufficient to ensure a subservient appearance. It would be sufficient distance from the roof hip lines to the rear of the building to sit comfortably within the roofspace.

The alterations to the rear elevation appear to be significant, although the remodelled 1st floor rear facade presents a much cleaner and simpler approach to the presently rather cluttered elevation, and is considered acceptable, being not visible from the streetscene and in the context of adjoining buildings of a variety of styles and façade treatments.

## **Amenity**

### 28 Christchurch Hill

The single-storey flat roof extension at the rear, next to 28 Christchurch Hill would be limited in height and would not result in any loss of light or overshadowing to this property. A condition preventing the roof of this structure from being used as amenity space is recommended, to ensure no loss of privacy to 28 Christchurch Hill. The proposed minimal increase in the depth of the building at first floor level closest to number 28 would be acceptable in amenity terms, as it would not project beyond the rear elevation of this property. The remodelling of the roof may result in some loss of light to second floor windows in the side of this property, which is understood to serve a study. However, there are also windows to the rear of this room so any loss of light is unlikely to be significant. There would be no direct views into any habitable windows at 28 Christchurch Hill.

### 32 Christchurch Hill

The ground floor side / rear extension would not result in any loss of amenity to 32 Christchurch Hill as it would not exceed the height of the existing boundary wall separating the two properties, although the proposed fencing around the terrace would be somewhat higher than the existing bamboo fence. Section drawings have been submitted to show there would be no significant loss of light to windows in the flank wall of this property. There are concerns regarding loss of privacy from the proposed terrace and rear most window in the side elevation of the extension. It is considered that the location and design of bamboo fence and trellis shown on

the plans needs to be adjusted as it seems to be closer than necessary at the rear and is not required at the front nor desirable in townscape terms projecting beyond the building line. A condition for further details, requiring a 1.8m high screen in alternative locations, is recommended. This would need to be positioned behind the proposed glass roof of the terrace to prevent loss of privacy and to ensure no loss of light to the nearest window in the side of number 32.

### Providence Corner

This property is located on Well Road but has a larger than average rear garden which abuts the rear of the site. Given the difference in ground levels, the proposed extensions to the building would not result in any significant loss of light or overshadowing to the rear garden. The proposed dormer would be larger than the existing dormer, but the internal arrangements would be such that only two of the windows would look out across this property's rear garden. It is considered that this would not result in a significant loss of privacy and would not be sufficient to warrant refusal of the application.

### **Trees**

There are a number of trees at the rear of the site, within the rear garden of Providence Corner. Following concerns regarding damage to these trees during the rebuilding of the rear retaining wall between the two properties and increasing its height, this element has been removed from the proposal. It is now proposed to build another boundary wall immediately in front of the existing wall, within the site and to the same height. The applicant has advised that the wall would be a maximum of 1.5m high, which is permitted development by virtue of Schedule 2, Part 2, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995.

### **Recommendation**

That permission be granted, subject to conditions.