

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		21/11/2007	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		14/11/2007	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Alex Bushell				2007/4939/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Flats 1 & 2 Heathwood House 28 Netherhall Gardens London NW3 5TH				Site Location Plan, 282-A-010, 011, 012, and 013.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
The erection of a part one, part two storey rear glazed extension, the modification of the existing rear ground and first floor elevation and the installation of an external stair from first floor rear to garden level all as an extension to the residential flats on the ground and first floors.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses	39	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		S/N displayed – no response					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		<p>The Fitzjohns/Netherhall CAAC objects stating as follows: “we have seldom seen a more outrageous attempt to disfigure a perfectly satisfactory Edwardian building” The Committee is also objects on the basis of light pollution.</p> <p>The Heath and Hampstead Society objects as the building is a good and typical example of architecture in the CA and the extensions and alts would be alien and damaging to its architecture out of character with the CA. The Society also considers the scheme would be wasteful of energy.</p>					

Site Description

Large detached residential building subdivided into flats in the Fitzjohns/Netherhall CA. The building is identified as one that makes a positive contribution to the area.

Relevant History

04/08/1981 PP for change of use and works of conversion to six self-contained flats, including side extension at ground and first floor and rear extension at ground floor;

31/03/1982 PP for conversion of existing house to four flats including the construction of a roof extension to the rear and a three-storey side extension;

01/09/1982 PP for construction of balcony and external staircase to the rear at first floor level and the insertion of a fixed arch window at the first floor in the flank wall;

24/12/2002 PP for erection of a summerhouse at the end of the rear garden;

19/03/2004 PP for the retention of the mechanically operated vehicular access gates, with the associated retention of the adjacent raised southern most pier;

22/01/2007 PP for change of use of two self-contained flats (part basement, ground and part first floor level) to one self-contained flat and alterations to fenestration at rear ground floor level;

02/04/2007 PP for change of use of Flats 1 & 2 on ground and first floors to form one single self-contained maisonette; erection of single storey glazed rear extension at ground floor level with balcony above and replacement of windows by doors at rear 1st floor level plus replacement of existing garden access staircase by new curved one.

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.

UDP: B1, B3, B7, SD6

SPG: Redington Frogna CA Statement

CPG: Roofs and terraces

Assessment

The application is only different from the example granted permission in April in as much as it now includes a two storey rear conservatory. All other changes in respect of the stair, loss of windows, loss of the bay have already been agreed.

The material planning considerations are as follows:

- The building is a good example of an Edwardian building that makes positive contribution to the Conservation Area;
- The generic guidance in respect of rear extensions seeks to achieve subservience in form by limiting the height of extensions to one storey below eaves – the two storey conservatory would not meet the guidance, with its roof sitting just below eaves;
- The generic guidance in respect of conservatories also seeks to achieve subservience in form and be located at ground and basement level unless there are exceptional circumstances;
- In this case the design of the extension is glazed but is not an 'off the shelf' conservatory. Consequently the Council must have regard to both design principles; and
- Whilst it is glazed, it would nonetheless appear bulky and dominant in respect of the rear elevation as a whole and would detract from the appearance of the building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The application is therefore recommended for refusal for the reason set out in the draft decision notice.