

Delegated Report (Member's Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	30/10/2007
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	17/10/2007
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Carlos Martin			2007/4432/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
72 and 74 South Hill Park London NW3 2SN			Refer to Draft Decision Notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of mansard roof extension, installation of dormer windows to front and sliding doors at rear, creation of rear roof terrace, increase in height of existing three storey side/rear extensions, excavation works to create sub-basements, alterations and additions to openings on rear elevation. Replacement of existing front entrance door, new bay window, erection of single storey side extension, extension to front lightwell and erection of new external staircase at no. 72.					
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	26	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	02
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Two letters received to report that the plans were not available on the Council's website. The plans were scanned immediately and the neighbours informed that a decision would not be made until the expiry date so that they would have a total of 21 days to comment.</p> <p>Three letters of objection based on the grounds of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Excavation works may damage foundations and water table.2. The side extension would impinge on the privacy of the adjoining property's garden and would block light to its side windows.3. The mansard and basement extensions would have a detrimental impact on the conservation area. A similar proposal for a mansard extension has been previously refused based on these grounds. <p><u>Officer's comment:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The structural issues derived from the excavation of the basements are covered by Building Control Regulations and not assessed at the planning stage. However, in this instance proposed basement is located close to Hampstead Ponds and there may be water displacement as a result of the excavation. A hydrology survey and structural survey is therefore required by condition.2. The proposed timber storage extension does not feature any side windows and therefore the privacy of the adjoining neighbours would be preserved. In terms of loss of light, the only window possibly affected has an obscured glass and does not appear to serve any habitable room. This extension, however, would appear to be "permitted development".3. The proposed mansards would be similar to the existing mansard of the adjoining property at no. 70 and would be set behind an existing front parapet wall, which would hide them from public view at street level. The bulk and appearance of these extensions would be in line with neighbouring properties, many of which have had similar roof extensions in the past, and would generally blend in well with the surroundings.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>South Hill Park CAAC: The proposal would improve the external character of the two houses. However, there are reservations in relation to the proposed basement excavation bearing in mind the proximity of the pond. Suggest that the terms of the article 4 direction are checked with great care.</p> <p><u>Officer's comment:</u> Art. 4 direction has been previously revoked. See above comments relating to water table.</p>					

Site Description

The application site relates to two adjoining three-storey mid-terraced single-family dwelling houses with basement, located on the west side of South Hill Park, next to the Heath. The houses form part of a group of three with an attached newer building to the north added following WW2 bomb damage. The site is within the South Hill Park Conservation Area and an area designated as the Hampstead and Highgate Ridge Area of Special Character in the UDP.

Relevant History

2002: pp granted to no. 74 for the erection of a second floor half-landing rear extension to house a lift; the formation of a front basement level boiler enclosure and store; the installation of new front stairs to basement level; and the erection of new brick piers and gate to front ground level.

2002: pp refused for a mansard extension at no. 74.

Reasons for refusal: *The proposed mansard roof would, by virtue of its scale, form and design, be detrimental to the appearance of the existing building, others within the cohesive architectural group of buildings, and consequently to the character and appearance of the surrounding Conservation Area, Area of Special Character and the designated open space.*

Relevant policies

UDP (2006): SD6, B1, B3 & B7.

Camden Planning Guidance.

South Hill Park Conservation Area Statement.

Assessment

Planning permission is sought for the erection of mansard roof extension, installation of dormer windows to front and sliding doors at rear, creation of rear roof terrace, increase in height of existing three storey side/rear extensions, excavation works to create sub-basements, alterations and additions to openings on rear elevation to nos. 72 and 74; and replacement of existing front entrance door, new bay window, erection of single storey side extension, extension to front lightwell and erection of new external staircase at no. 72 only.

Design

The proposed mansard extensions would feature three front dormers on each property and glazed sliding doors at the rear, forming roof terraces at the rear with glass balustrades 0.5m high. The mansards would be similar to the existing mansard of the adjoining property at no. 70 and would be set behind an existing front parapet wall, which would hide them from public view at street level. The bulk and appearance of these extensions would be in line with neighbouring properties, many of which have had similar roof extensions in the past. Therefore, in design terms, the proposal would blend in well with its surroundings.

At the rear, the existing three-storey back-additions would be raised by 0.7m approximately and their existing slates roofs replaced with lead roofs. Most rear windows would be replaced by timber framed sash windows, giving the rear façade a homogeneous appearance. Similarly, the railings of the first floor balcony of no. 72 would be replaced by railings to match the balcony of no. 74. Finally, the doors to access the rear gardens will be replaced by timber framed folding glazed doors. The loss of an original rear window at lower ground floor level is regrettable. However, overall the appearance of the rear elevation would be improved in design terms.

The underground alterations would involve the excavation of a subbasement floor to provide the properties with storage, plant, sauna and laundry rooms. These alterations do not affect the character of the conservation area and so they are considered acceptable. The proposed front and side alterations would affect no. 72 only and would involve extending the front lightwell and replacing the two bay windows and front door to match those of no. 74. These alterations would add to the uniformity of the pair and should not harm the appearance of the conservation area. To the side, a covered timber garden storage would be erected at lower ground floor level and a window and door relocated.

Amenity

No significant impact on neighbouring properties is expected as a result of the proposal. The proposed roof extensions and rear roof terraces would inevitably offer views of the surroundings. However, the property backs onto a park and therefore only the gardens of the adjacent properties could be overlooked. These gardens are already overlooked from a number of windows and the balconies at first floor level; therefore it is considered that there would be no loss of privacy for these neighbours compared with the existing situation of mutual overlooking of adjoining properties.

Given that the height of the back-additions would be raised less than a metre and that these do not project further than the rear building line of both adjoining properties, there would be no significant impact in terms of loss of light or outlook or increased sense of enclosure. The proposed garden storage of no. 72 would be built along the boundary with no. 70. However, the only window possibly affected has an obscured glass and does not appear to serve any habitable room.

Impact on water table

Given the location of Hampstead Ponds to the application site and the excavation proposed a hydrology and structural survey is required. Whilst it is unlikely that any underground water is feeding into the ponds any displaced water as a result of the excavation could have an impact on adjoining properties and could cause the surface water of the Ponds to rise. Mitigation measures would therefore be necessary. The survey should include details of any water in the vicinity of the proposed works and if so what the likely impact of the displacement of this water would be. Details of proposed drainage measures will be required.

Recommendation

Grant planning permission subject to conditions.