

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	04/05/2015
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	23/04/2015
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Jonathan McClue			2015/1354/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
46 Alma Street, London. NW5 3DH			Refer to Decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Construction of a part single, part two storey rear extension.				
Recommendation(s):	Refuse Permission			
Application Type:	Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	08	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
Summary of consultation responses:			No. electronic	02		
	<p>A site notice was displayed from 27/03/2015 and the application was advertised in the local press on 02/04/2015.</p> <p>Objections were received from nearby residents at 47 Alma Street and 4 and 6 Raglan Street. Their objections are summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of white brick would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the surrounding area • First floor rear element would be bulky and out of scale • Proposed glazing is inappropriate and out of keeping with prevailing pattern of development • The proposed corner window at first floor level would result in a material level of overlooking and loss of privacy to adjoining occupiers • Loss of light to kitchen window at 47 Alma Street <p><u>Officer Response:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of white brick is considered inappropriate and Officers would prefer the use of a London yellow stock brick. See Design and Impact on the Inkerman Conservation Area, Section 2.0 • The first floor extension by way of its height, width, flat roof and overall scale and bulk is considered to be harmful to the appearance of the host building and the character and appearance of the conservation area. See Design and Impact on the Inkerman Conservation Area, Section 2.0 • It is considered that the first floor glazing would be out of keeping with the surrounding buildings and a more traditional rear window would be preferred. See Design and Impact on the Inkerman Conservation Area, Section 2.0 • Due to the location and size of the corner window proposed it would result in materially detrimental harm to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers. See Residential Amenity, Section 3.0 • Given the location and orientation of the extensions they are not considered to result in a material loss of light or outlook to the adjacent occupier. See Residential Amenity, Section 3.0 					

**CAAC/Local groups
comments:**

None consulted and no responses received.

Site Description

This application relates to a two storey mid-terraced dwelling located on the north-eastern side of Alma Street within the Inkerman Conservation Area. The host building has a butterfly roof and benefits from a single storey rear extension. The adjacent building at 45 Alma Street has a full width single storey rear extension with a first floor pitched roof element above. 47 Alma Street, the adjacent property to the south, has a single storey half-width extension and while it was granted permission for a two storey rear extension, this has not been implemented and has since lapsed. There are examples of two storey rear extensions within the surrounding development.

The Inkerman Conservation Area Statement states that all of the properties on Alma Street were constructed of London yellow stock brick and most have stucco surroundings to windows and doors. The building is noted as making a positive contribution to the conservation area as part of 25-52 Alma Street.

Relevant History

46 Alma Street (application site):

2006/5088/P: A Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed) was approved for the construction of a single storey rear extension on 23/01/2007.

Immediate Context:

44 Alma Street - 2008/2702/P: Planning permission was granted for a two storey rear extension on 09/09/2008.

45 Alma Street - 2009/5600/P: Planning permission was granted for a single storey infill and first floor rear extension on 27/04/2010.

49 Alma Street – 2010/0734/P: Planning permission was refused by the Council for a part single, part two storey rear extension on 05/05/2010. An appeal was allowed on 23/09/2010 under APP/X5210/D/10/2133195/WF.

Relevant policies

NPPF 2012

Paragraphs 14, 17, 56-68 and 126-141

London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011

Policies 7.4, 7.6 and 7.8

Local Development Framework 2010

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

CPG1 (Design) 2014 – Chapters: 2, 3 and 4

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011 – Chapters: 6 and 7

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for a part single, part two storey rear extension.

1.2 The ground floor rear element would have a depth of 3.67m; a width of 5.08m (full width of the application site) and a flat roof with a height of 3.07m.

1.3 The first floor rear element would have a depth of 3.64m; a width of 3.18m and a flat roof with a height of 5.87m above ground level. It would have a corner window on the side and rear elevations. An openable window is proposed to the rear with translucent glass to the side.

1.4 The proposed extension would be constructed of white facing brick and felt roof. The framing of the openings are specified as being either timber or aluminium.

1.5 A conservation style rooflight would be added to the main butterfly roof of the dwelling. It is noted that this could be implemented without planning permission under Part 1, Class C of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended). Therefore it does not form part of the development description or assessment. Notwithstanding this, it is considered acceptable as it would be concealed from views and in keeping with similar development in the area.

1.6 Revisions were made to the drawings following feedback from Officers. There was a reduction to the height and width of the first floor element and changes to the proposed corner window to make it full height and translucent on the side elevation. Despite the revisions, the proposal is still unacceptable and these objections were made known to the applicant who accepted a refusal in this instance.

2.0 Design and Impact on the Inkerman Conservation Area

2.1 Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) states in paragraphs 4.10 and 4.12 that new extensions should be secondary to the host building in terms of form, scale, proportions and detailing and respect the existing pattern of rear extensions in an area. Paragraph 4.13 states that extensions higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or rise above the general height of neighbouring extensions, will be strongly discouraged. The Inkerman Road Conservation Area Statement states that rear extensions should not adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached and in most cases extensions should be no more than one storey in height. Policy Ink21 within the Inkerman Road Conservation Area Statement denotes that extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace. The small scale, form and vertical proportions of the buildings as well as the v-shaped roofs form an important part of the character of the buildings on this side of Alma Street and the wider conservation area.

2.2 The proposed extension is not a full storey below the eaves of the host building and extends to within 450mm of the valley of the butterfly roof. While other buildings within the adjoining parade have rear additions that are not set a full storey below the eaves of the building they serve, they have generally been sensitively designed at a lower height or use a pitched roof to give the extension a more subordinate appearance. Examples of this include 44 and 45 Alma Street which have a pitched roof with a gable on the rear elevation to reduce its visual bulk and 49 Alma Street, considered to be an unacceptable development as it extends along the width of the rear elevation, which has a mono-pitched roof. Therefore, the proposal would not be in accordance with paragraph 4.13 of CPG1 nor

policy Ink21 of the Inkerman Road Conservation Area Statement as it would not be sensitively designed as per the other approvals in the surrounding area. A lower roof form or a pitched design would be required to comply with the above policies.

2.3 The proposed first floor rear extension is considered to materially harm the character and appearance of the host building and the Inkerman Conservation Area. This is due to:

- The height of the proposal and its relationship to the valley of the host building's roof. It would result in the first floor element being an incongruous addition to the dwelling
- The height of the first floor element in relation to existing rear extensions which are generally set below what is being proposed here with more sympathetic roof forms. Examples of the more sympathetic roof forms include a mono-pitch at 49 Alma and the pitched roofs with gables facing the rear at 44 and 45.
- The first floor flat roof design which is out of character with the predominant development of the area and harmful to the appearance of the dwelling. Its flat roof further detracts from the appearance of the host building and forms a poor relationship with the butterfly roof
- The width of the first floor element is dominant across the majority of the rear elevation (63%). Its width, in combination with the height and flat roof, makes the proposal an incongruous addition to the rear elevation that detracts from the original appearance of the building which would become unrecognisable. In addition, the width proposed is greater than the majority of extensions in the immediate context
- The proposed window treatment with a full height corner window at first floor level is out of keeping with the more traditional windows of the host and surrounding properties. The scale of the glazing proposed, particularly on the side elevation, significantly detracts from the appearance of the building and surrounding area and would be unsympathetic. The window would have a width of 1.7m and it would cover 4.7sq.m or 46% of the first floor side elevation
- White brick is proposed to the ground and first floor elements. Officers consider that white brick may be appropriate at ground floor level as the existing extension is currently rendered and less prominent from wider views, however, the use of this material at first floor level would not be acceptable as it would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development and be prominent from surrounding properties

2.4 Based on the above, the proposal is considered to be a dominant and harmful addition that would significantly detract from the appearance of the host building. It would be out of keeping with this side of Alma Street and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Inkerman Conservation Area.

3.0 Residential Amenity

Impact on light and outlook of surrounding occupiers

3.1 The proposed ground and first floor extensions would match the depth of an existing extension to the immediate property at 45 Alma Street. It would therefore not be likely to result in a significant loss of light or outlook to those occupiers.

3.2 The adjacent building at 47 Alma Street has a half-width single storey rear extension. Its ground floor rear and side windows serve a kitchen and bathroom and are already affected by an existing single storey rear extension at 46 Alma Street (host dwelling). Due to the nature of these windows and their relationship with the host dwelling, it is not considered that the proposed ground floor extension would result in a material level of harm to those occupiers over the existing situation. The first floor element of the proposal would be setback by 1.92m from the shared boundary and it is not considered that it would result in any undue harm by way of a loss of light or outlook.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

3.3 The first floor extension would introduce a full height corner window with a significant section on the side elevation which is objectionable in design terms as explained in paragraph 2.3. The submitted details indicate that it would be made of translucent glass to ensure that overlooking could not occur. While the glazing is inappropriate from a design perspective, it could not be said to introduce overlooking or a loss of privacy if it were translucent glass. If the development were to be appropriate, which it is not, then Officers would ensure that a planning condition were to be attached to ensure the implementation and retention of the translucent glass.

4.0 Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

