

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	11/09/2007
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	29/8/2007
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Hugh Miller			2007/3596/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
8 Downside Crescent London NW3 2AP			DWC/PL/02; 03; 04; 05; 06; 07; 08; 09; 10; 11 Rev B; 12 Rev B; 13 Rev A; 14 Rev A; 15 Rev A; 16 Rev B; 17 Rev B; 18 Rev A; 19 Rev B; 20 Rev B;	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Excavation of a basement with single storey rear extension above, erection of a two storey side extension with hipped roof form, erection of enlarged replacement rear dormers and erection of infill roof extension on front roofslope to single family dwellinghouse (C3).				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	02	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<u>2 Downside Crescent</u>					
	<p>Concerns about the noise nuisance, dust and dirt from the development,</p> <p>Concern about the impact of the development on the elderly neighbour at no.6 who has Parkinsons disease and stress of the adjacent works may hasten her health conditions,</p> <p>The proposed works are to increase the value of the property.</p> <u>10 Downside Crescent</u>					
	<p>The applicant has made two applications in 2006, specifically 2006/0909/P submitted on 06.03.2006 and 2006/5636/P submitted on 18.12.2006. Both of these applications were withdrawn before the decision was made. The present application 2007/3596/P contains only minor modifications to the previous applications.</p> <p>The proposed plans have not been modified to allay my concerns about the redevelopment of 8 Downside Crescent.</p> <p>I objected to the 2006/5636/P application and all my comments and objections contained in the letter, which is on your file, are equally valid with respect to the present application.</p> <p>My objections are related to the changes in the external appearance of 8 Downside Crescent, which is a half of the building containing also 10 Downside Crescent. The two semi-detached houses have been constructed in a unique Arts and Crafts architectural style. They are the sole representative houses of this style in the street.</p> <p>I am concerned that the integrity of the original Arts and Crafts design of the building is undermined by the proposed changes at 8 Downside Crescent, as in the previous applications. I believe that the conservation area status should help to ensure that redevelopments are carried in keeping with the original architectural style.</p> <p>Specifically, the proposed box extension on the ground floor of 8 Downside Crescent is alien to the architectural style of the building. The proposed design of windows upsets the balance and symmetry of the building. The ground floor doors to the garden and the large side window are not in keeping with the rest of the building.</p> <p>The proposed window and door finishes, with large modern glass panes, clash with the existing small-framed windows and doors found in the both semi-detached houses. In fact the existing small-framed glass doors (in Arts and Crafts style) are proposed to be replaced by the large modern glass</p>					

	<p>doors. I note that the disregard for the window style extends to the proposed new window on the second floor on the street side.</p> <p><u>Thames Water Observation:</u></p> <p>The applicants should incorporate within their proposal, protection to the property by installing for example, a non-return valve or other suitable device to avoid the risk of backflow during storm conditions.</p>
<p>CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify</p>	<p><u>Parkhill CAAC:</u></p> <p>No objections.</p>

Site Description

A 2-storey semi-detached building situated on the south side of Downside Crescent, east of the junction with Haverstock Hill. There is an existing single-storey conservatory extension at the rear and a small timber structure on the west side and adjacent to no.6. There is an existing gap between the application building and no.6 providing views due southwest into the rear garden. The property is in Parkhill C.A.

Relevant History

September 2005- pp granted for Change of use from ground and first-floor self-contained maisonette and attic self-contained flat to a single dwellinghouse, ref. 2005/3919/P.

March 2006 application **withdrawn** for Erection of a side and rear extension with the remodelling of the rear dormer window for additional habitable room to the existing dwellinghouse, ref. 2006/0909/P.

December 2006 Pp **withdrawn** for Erection of a side and rear extension with partial basement to single family dwellinghouse (C3), ref. 2006/5636/P.

3.1.08- 2007/5005- pp granted for erection of rear and side extensions plus basement and replacement rear dormers

Relevant policies

Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. 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.

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:

Parkhill CA Statement:.

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:

- Excavation of a basement with single storey rear extension above;
- erection of a two storey side extension including hipped roof form to replace existing gabled end roof,
- enlarged rear dormer to replace existing one
- erection of infill roof extension on front roofslope between existing gabled and hipped roof wings

Background

In March and December 2006 identical planning applications for the erection of a side and rear extension with the remodelling of the rear dormer window for additional habitable room to the existing dwellinghouse. The applications were withdrawn following discussions between officers and the agents/ architects. The concerns raised were as follows:

- the footprint of the proposed single-storey rear extension is excessive and almost full-width,
- the single-storey extension would not be subordinate to the main building,
- the extension should be light-weight in its appearance rather than its solid appearance,
- the 2-storey side extension in terms of design, bulk and height would impact detrimentally on the appearance of the building.

This current application has been superseded by a later one (see history) which incorporates revisions required by officers to make the scheme more acceptable in design and bulk terms; in particular the rear extension has been reduced in total width by 2.5m, it is slightly less deep and it has a different design idiom with different proportioned and increased glazing; the front roofslope infill has also been omitted entirely.

Design

The dimensions of the existing extensions are **a)** glazed conservatory 2.8m depth x 3.6m width x 2.6m height and **b)** timber structure 1.6m width x 2.4m depth, with a total of 13.92sqm.

The proposed basement and ground floor rear extension measures 9.5m width x 6.1m depth x 3.5m height, total 115.9sqm. The 2-storey side extension comprises realignment of the roof pitch together with an increase in floorspace approximately 20.0sqm.

The rear elevation of the host building is unimpaired by extensions. The proposed basement and single-storey extension would be almost full-width and measures approx. 9.5m (the host building measures 11.7m width). On its west side is an existing dilapidated glazed single-storey conservatory extension, which is set back from the common boundary with no.6

Policy B3A justification states, para.3.31 *"Alterations and extensions can allow buildings to be enlarged, adapted and used more flexible. However, ... alterations and extensions can cause harm to the appearance of a building and the character of the surrounding area. Alterations and extensions should follow the form, proportions and character of the building to which they relate. Para. 3.32 states "Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. It also states, 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 rear and roof extensions are considered unacceptable:

- in terms of design, bulk and footprint, the proposed rear extension would severely diminish the

overall proportions and visibility of the rear elevation of the house and would harm the appearance of the host building. The extension is almost full-width, projecting beyond the side building line, and would dominate rather than being subordinate to the host building; it should be noted that the rear extension on the approved scheme reduces this width by 1.5m on one side and by 1m on the other, and has more traditional smaller glazed openings, thus making it more subservient and less bulky,

- the proposed extension, with its overly solid features and minimum simple window openings, appears excessively bulky and would become visually dominant, conflicting with the design 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 on rear extension guidelines and is unacceptable,
- the detailing and proportions of the proposed window and door finishes (large modern glass panes, clashing with the existing small framed windows and doors) are unsympathetic features detracting from the architectural integrity of this semi-detached house and harm its Arts and Crafts style,
- the infilling of the front roof slope between the hipped and gabled roof projections is totally unacceptable in principle; being very visible in the public realm, it would harm the existing roof form, detracting from the articulated and complex roofscape, the appearance of the building and the character of the conservation area and would not be in compliance with roof guidelines of the C.A Statement,
- The cumulative impact of the rear extension, use of materials and design detailing, and bulk and location of the roof alterations would impact not only on the appearance of the building but also detract from the character and appearance of the C.A. The proposal is contrary to policy B7.
- there is no objection in principle to the provision of a new basement floor or the side extension with hipped roof form or the replacement rear dormers; it is the overall footprint and bulk of the rear extension, which is considered excessive, and the principle of the front roof extension which is considered inappropriate.

Neighbour amenity

The proposed extension would not impact on neighbour amenity through loss of privacy or overlooking; neither would it cause loss of sun/ daylight to the habitable rooms of the adjacent properties. The proposal accords 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