

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	19/11/2007
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	31/10/2007
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Hugh Miller			2007/4370/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
46 Hillway Highgate London N6 6EP			Drawing Issue Sheet; Site Location Plan; 07026-01; 02 A; 03 A	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Increase of the height of the rear extension, as an amendment to planning permission dated 12th April 2006 (ref 2006/0889/P for the demolition of existing garage and car port and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension to the existing dwellinghouse).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	<b>02</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
			No. Electronic	<b>01</b>		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The objector raised concerns about the loss sun/daylight from habitable rooms by the increase in height of the rear extension.</p> <p>However, if the height of the new extension will be no more than a coping stone higher than the existing wall, no objection to the proposed development.</p> <p><b>Officer Comment:</b> Rear windows at no.48 Hillway are orientated due southeast and the marginal increase in the parapet height (600mm) is unlikely to reduce sun/daylight from habitable rooms. Neither would there be any impact on outlook.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Holly Lodge Estate CAAC: Object.</p> <p>Concern of not been informed that the previous application ref.2006/0889/P was granted planning permission. Objections were raised about its full-width and the CAAC still object most strongly.</p> <p>The footprints of the current proposal appears larger than the extant scheme and repeat very strong objections.</p> <p>No objections to raising the height of the extension roof or the parapet. The views of the neighbours affected must be taken into account.</p> <p>The Estate Trustees must approve additional parking on the forecourt.</p> <p><b>Officer Comment:</b> The principle of the extension has been established by the grant of planning permission in March 2006. Moreover, there is no increase in the footprint of the extension.</p>					

## Site Description

The application site is a two storey detached dwellinghouse on the East side of Hillway, just north of Makepeace Mansions. The rear garden of the property slopes upwards towards the boundary with 113-130 Makepeace Mansions.

The property is in the Holly Lodge Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

In 2005 permission was refused for the demolition of existing garage and car port and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension to the existing dwellinghouse, (2004/4807/P) on grounds that

- a. The proposed ground floor side extension by reason of its siting, scale and design would be an insubordinate addition to the parent building, which would erode the sense of openness between buildings of this part of Hillway. This would be detrimental to the composition and symmetry of the streetscene and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- b. The proposed rear extension, by reason of its bulk, scale design and materials would fail to relate to the scale, proportions of the parent building and pattern of development of the surrounding area.

In 2006 Pp was granted for the demolition of existing garage and carport and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension to the existing dwellinghouse, ref. 2006/0889/P.

## 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 2.7 Alterations and extensions

## Assessment

The main issues are i) design, ii) building bulk and the impact on the appearance of the building and on the character and appearance of the C.A. iii) neighbour amenity.

## Background

In April 2006 planning permission was granted for the demolition of existing single-storey garage and carport and the erection of a single storey side and rear extension plus lantern rooflights to the existing dwellinghouse. The approved scheme has not been implemented and remains extant and comprises the following:

- ✓ the erection of a single storey flat-roofed side extension which would end 1.4 metres recessed from the front elevation,
- ✓ projecting softwood rooflights on the side extension would be masked from view to the front by a raised pitched roof on the front of the side extension,
- ✓ pitched roof ridge measuring 3.9 metres in height and made from red clay plain tiles,
- ✓ a rear extension of full-width, measuring 2.9 metres tall and would project approximately 4 metres into the garden along the boundary to the south,
- ✓ a condition would be added to ensure that the new windows on the side extension are timber framed,

### Rear Extension

- ✓ the rear extension would be built on the site of the existing patio, which abuts the side extension and rear buildings of number 44 and is bordered by a 1.8 metre tall timber fence.
- ✓ the raised lantern rooflight on the proposed rear extension has been reduced considerably in bulk and appearance and has been centred on the south element of the extension,
- ✓ the northern side of the rear extension would be set back 1.25m from the south element, which seeks to minimise the bulk and gives the appearance of subordination to the main dwelling,
- ✓ on the boundary with number 48 the height of the proposed extension would be approximately 0.5 metres lower and would extend 2 metres further into the rear garden than the existing garage. The raised earth bank on the boundary would be partially excavated for the addition.
- ✓ no impact on amenity to the occupiers of number 48 would occur from the proposed extension.
- ✓ The resultant increase in height of the boundary wall would not have an adverse effect on the outlook or sense of enclosure in the garden of number 44. Further into the garden the existing raised wall and trellis structure would mean that there be no overlooking from number 46 into the neighbouring garden.

## Current proposal

This application proposes the following:

- ✓ Increase of the parapet height of the rear extension, as an amendment to planning permission dated 12th April 2006 (ref 2006/0889/P)

The parapet height of the approved rear and side extension are in alignment and set below the side and rear rooflights. The height of the approved scheme measures 2.9m. The proposed raised parapet would increase the height of the rear extension by 800mm, from 2.9m to 3.7m. There would be a 200mm difference in height between the parapet levels of the side and rear extensions to ensure that it would be subordinate to the host building. The increase in parapet height would also enable some alterations to the rear elevation, such as increase double door height and replaced window for new door.

Whilst the extant approved scheme has a lightweight appearance, the increase height to the parapet would enlarge the solid areas of the elevation. Notwithstanding this, the enlarged brick surface would not be visible from the public domain and given its location officers consider that the proposed alteration would not harm the appearance of the host building or detract from the C.A.

On the southern boundary with no.44 and in common with most houses is an existing gap (approx. 2.0m) between the main dwellinghouse and the host building, no.46. The land and rear garden of the application site is at a lower level and slopes north to south. No.44 also projects forward of the host building by approx.1.1m and has no windows within its northern flank wall. The height of the common boundary wall/ fence of the host building is also higher than the existing buildings within the rear garden of no.44. Given the lie of the land and lack of windows the proposed would not impact on day/ sunlight or outlook of occupiers at no. 44 which lies due south. Neither would there be any overlooking of loss of privacy.

The applicant has confirmed that the original levels between no. 48 and the host building was incorrect, nevertheless the height increase to the parapet of 575mm would not be dissimilar to the height of the existing garage building and therefore there would be minimal differences between the visual building bulk of the proposed and the existing. On the northern boundary, the rear windows at no.48 are orientated due southeast with views across the side extension. On the boundary with number 48 the raised earth bank would be partially excavated for the addition. Notwithstanding the marginal increase in parapet height (575mm) it is unlikely that the amenity of the occupiers of no. 48 would be adversely affected in terms of loss of sun/daylight or outlook by the proposed extension. The proposed accord with SD6.

In conclusion, the proposed increase in parapet height would not impact on the appearance of the host building or on neighbour amenity and is satisfactory.

Grant Planning Permission