

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	15/05/2015
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	30/04/2015
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Nanayaa Ampoma			2015/1667/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
Unit 5 Hampstead West 224 Iverson Road London NW6 2HU			See draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of rear ground floor extension and installation of rear dormer to B1 commercial unit.				
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	38	No. of responses	09	No. of objections	09
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Neighbouring properties were also notified via direct letters. Neighbour objections have been received from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 28 Rowntree Close. West Hampstead • Flat 3 Redcroft, 226 Iverson road West Hampstead • Flat 5 Redcroft, 226 Iverson road West Hampstead • Flat 7 Redcroft, 226 Iverson road West Hampstead • Flat 6 Redcroft, 226 Iverson road West Hampstead • Flat 8 Redcroft, 226 Iverson road West Hampstead • Flat 10 Redcroft, 226 Iverson road West Hampstead <p>These comments can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works could add to further subsidence in the area • Application should be refused for the same reasons as that at unit 9 in 2012. • Development would interrupt the roofline of the adjoining terraced houses in Rowntree Close and other buildings in Hampstead West. • It will destroy the classic design/uniformity/vista of the complex. • Proposed material, zinc cladding, is totally out of keeping with the striking red brick, which is an intrinsic architectural feature of all the buildings of Hampstead West and Redcroft. • The name "Redcroft" was coined from the character of this red brick which is the signature of these two developments. • The proposed changes do not respect the scale and uniformity of the roofs of Hampstead West. • The new design will rise beyond the pitched roof. • The new design negatively impacts on the character of the area, giving an unsettling/entropic impression in its disrespect of the design which was created to link all nine buildings and produce one complete and pleasing design for the complex that is Hampstead West. <p><i>Officer response: please see section titled Design for comments on design. In relation to subsidence, the application does not comprise of a basement, therefore this is not relevant to its assessment.</i></p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	The application site does not fall in a conservation area. No comments have been received from local groups.					

Site Description

The application site relates to a two storey commercial property that forms part of a relatively large estate development. The property is not in a conservation area and is not listed.

Relevant History

2014/6962/P: Erection of rear ground floor extension and installation of rear dormer to B1 commercial unit.- **Withdrawn 09/01/2015**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan (2011)

Core Strategy (2010)

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage

Development Policies (2010)

DP24 Securing High Quality Design

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Supplementary Planning Policies

Camden Planning Guidance 1 Design (2014)

Camden Planning Guidance 6 Amenity (2011)

Assessment

Proposal

The application seeks planning permission for the development of a roof dormer and a rear extension. The proposed dormer would span the full width of the roof and the proposed ground floor extension would measure 2 metres deep and 3 metres high. It would infill the areas at either side of the existing rear protrusion.

The main issues for discussion are:

- Design
- Amenity

Design

Policies CS15 of the Core Strategy and DP24 of the Development Policies states that the Council will require all developments including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest design standards in terms of the character, setting, context, form and scale to the existing building and the general area.

Supplementary design guidance contained within CPG 1 (Design) provides details on how the above policies will be applied. This states that roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable if they would have an adverse impact on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene. This includes:

- Those developments in an unbroken roofline that are largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions
- Buildings designed as a complete architectural composition and the proposed development would undermine the style or roof level.
- Where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by an additional roof extension.

The proposed dormer would span the full width of the rear roof elevation. There are no other dormers on any of the properties that form part of the estate that the site belongs to. Therefore there is an

unbroken roofline. Additionally, the proposed dormer is much too large and would dominant the roof design and rear elevation of the property. The proposed materials would also add to the negative impact of the property. Given its size and location, the dormer would represent an incongruous element in the roofscape. Therefore it is considered unsympathetic to the context and the character of the property and would have a significantly harmful impact on the architectural composition of the building estate and would detract from the appearance of the existing area. Thereby failing to meet points1, 2 and 3 of the CPG1 detailed above. In fact development a roof dormer, especially of this size, is objected to in principle at the site because of the harm it would have on the whole area and the unbroken roofline as whole.

Although the proposed ground floor extension is relatively minor in size the layout of the building lines in the area do not lend themselves to such additions. The proposed infill extension at either end of the existing rear projection would immediately alter the character of the building. Should the building be situated elsewhere and not form part of composition it is likely that the extension would be acceptable. However due to the architectural merits of the estate, the consideration of the development must also consider the impact on the whole. The development would set a precedent which in time would erode the architectural integrity and consistence of the estate. Therefore the proposed ground floor extension does not relate to the character, setting and context of the site and also fails to comply with policies CS5 and DP24.

Amenity

Under planning guidance CPG6, all developments are required to have some regard for the amenity of existing and future occupants. Policies CS5 (Core Strategy) and DP26 (Development Policies) state that the council will protect the quality of life of existing and future occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for those developments that would not have a harmful effect on amenity. Such issues include visual overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels.

The application proposed three windows at roof level looking towards the rear neighbours. However there are several windows at this elevation already. Therefore it is unlikely that the addition widows would significantly alter the existing amenity arrangement in the area in terms of overlooking. There are no other amenity issues envisaged.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission