| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date | 06/03/2 | 015 | |
|---|--|----------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------------|------------|--|
| | | N/A / attached | | Consultatio Expiry Date | n 06/02/2 | 06/02/2015 | |
| Officer | | | Application Nu | | • | | |
| Raymond Yeung | | | 2014/7867/P | | | | |
| Application Address | | | Drawing Numb | Drawing Numbers | | | |
| 2A Well Walk London NW3 1LD | | | See fdn | | | | |
| PO 3/4 Area Tea | m Signature | C&UD | Authorised Of | ficer Signatu | re | | |
| | . | | | <u> </u> | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| Replacement of existing conservatory with a hardwood framed conservatory on the first floor southern elevation. | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): Refuse | | | | | | | |
| Application Type: Householder Ap | | r Applica | tion | | | | |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | otice | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | 1 | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | No. notified | 05 | No. of responses | | of objections | 00 | |
| | Site notice di | snlaved fr | No. electronic | 2015 | | | |
| Summary of consultation responses: | Site notice displayed from 16.01.2015-6.02.2015 Press notice displayed from 16.01.2015-5.02.2015 | | | | | | |
| | - No letters of response received to date | | | | | | |
| | Hampstead CAAC were consulted but made no comments to date. | | | | | | |
| CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify | Trampsicau C | 5, v (O WGI | C CONSUITED DUT MADE | o no comme | io to date. | | |

Site Description

The application site is a four storey end of terrace corner plot property located on the east side of Well Walk and to the north of Willow Road. The property has been divided into flats and this application relates to the first floor flat. The property is located in the Hampstead Conservation Area and forms part of an area with a designated Article 4 direction, but is not statutory listed.

Relevant History

E7/4/11/26025- Erection of a conservatory to enclose existing roof terrace at first floor level. (*Granted:* 26/04/1978)

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework
The London Plan

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 (Design) 2013

CPG 6 (Amenity) 2011

Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (October 2001)

Assessment

Proposal

Permission is sought for the erection of a first floor side conservatory to replace an existing lean-to style one. The new one would be of painted hardwood with a larger size and height by having a box shape and orangery-style lantern roof.

It would be on the footprint of the existing conservatory which is of 2.1 metres depth and 3.8 metres width. The height of the proposal would be almost 3.7 metres in height which is 0.8 metres taller than the existing lean-to conservatory.

The site is within the Hampstead Conservation Area and designated Article 4 Direction.

Assessment

The material planning considerations raised by this application are the impact of the proposal on the character and the appearance of the property and the conservation area and the impact of the proposal on neighbouring amenity.

Design

It is acknowledged that the existing extension was given permission which was to enclose the former roof terrace; however this was dated 1978 which pre-dates the current policies and guidance. It is also considered to be more modest, subtle and in-keeping with the host building than the proposed.

DP25 (page 117) of Camden Development Policies states that in order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

Camden's Design Guidance states that extensions should be designed proportionally in relation to the existing buildings and groups of buildings, and in particular should be secondary to the building being extended in terms of form, scale and proportions.

CPG1 in paragraph 4.19 states that Conservatories should normally- be subordinate to the building being extended in terms of height, mass, bulk, plan form and detailing; respect and preserve existing architectural features, e.g. brick arches, windows etc; be located at ground or basement level. Only in exceptional circumstances will conservatories be allowed on upper levels; be of a high quality in both materials and design.

Although it would be replacing an existing conservatory, the proposed conservatory is considered to be larger and the design of the roof form and window fenestrations would not be in-keeping with the host and neighbouring properties.

The proposed orangery glass lantern roof, which would be capped off with grey powder coated aluminium, is considered to be out-of-keeping to the host building and neighbouring area. Unlike the existing, the casements on the conservatory would not align and would be larger than the window openings on the host property. The proposal is visually prominent on the first floor on a corner plot property, which is exposed to wider public views and would therefore harm the character and appearance of the streetscene.

With the above taken into consideration, the proposal would result in a visually dominant additional bulk to the host property harming the character and integrity of the host building it forms a part. The proposed extension is therefore not considered to preserve and enhance the conservation area and is contrary to the guidance set out in paragraph 4.19 of CPG1 (page 35), policy H29 (page 62) of the

| Hampstead Conservation Area Statement and Policies DP24 and DP25 of the Local Development Framework. |
|--|
| Amenity: Due to the nature of the proposal being a replacement of a single storey extension facing the street and not extending beyond the footprint of the existing or materially above its height, the proposal would not result in any harm to neighbouring amenity. This accords to LDF policy DP26 and CPG6 paragraph 6.6 (page 32). |
| Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |