

The Planning Inspectorate  
1/23 Hawk Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol  
BS1 6PN

17<sup>th</sup> August 2015

Planning appeal for an extension to a Dwelling

## Design Statement

Flat 2, 75 Chetwynd Rd. NW5 1DA

Applicants: Mr Pietro FRATTA & Mrs Arianna TUCCI

Planning reference number is 2015/2434/P Camden Planning and built environment



## 1.0 Introduction

This document is compiled in order to appeal with The Planning Inspectorate for an extension to the dwelling located at first and second floor at 75 Chetwynd Rd. NW5 1DA within Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

The planning was refused on 24th June 2015, less than 12 weeks ago. Therefore within the time frame to submit an appeal for a householder planning application.

## 2.0 Location

The property is part of a group of terrace houses with a continuous similar pattern varied built in 1870-80s.

The building is split in two flats. The first at ground floor with access to the rear garden and the second at first and second floor with access to a terraced roof. The latter is a three bedroom flat with a single bathroom.

The front façade is brickwork which is predominant in the East part of Chetwynd Road. The back elevation is white render.

The roof is predominantly flat with only a small front section which is a pitch roof fitted with a dormer

## 3.0 Project

The Works comprise the erection of a new extension for the whole width of the building over the existing terraced roof including a bathroom and a small accessory space.

The proposal will extend to half of the existing terrace still allowing access to the external space. It will be fitted with a pitch roof which is considered to be more suitable with the area (from point 7.48 of Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement Adopted 22 January 2009: "*Nos.64-94 (even) form a continuous terrace with a mix of designs and height. Most of the properties are three storeys with a pitched roof*")

The back extension will have a maximum eaves height of 2.6 meters and the ridge will not exceed 3.6 meters. The extension will open toward the terrace with a three-leaves timber glazed door. The new door will be panelled with glazing bars to match existing windows.

The bathroom will be fitted at high level with a small bottom-hinged window with frosted glass for natural ventilation and light.

The roof will be finished with slate matching the existing ones on the small pitch roof to the front.

External walls will be brickwork matching the front facade.

Additionally, the asphalt mastic on the terrace is in a bad conservation status, it is planned to add insulation and a new finish mastic to solve leaking problems and improve the building thermal efficiency.

The house has three bedroom and only one bathroom which is deemed to be insufficient, the extension will not increase the dwelling capacity but it will make the property more suitable for the number of people which can be hosted at the present situation.

Furthermore, it is one of the few houses with flat roof and rendered façade. It is believed that adding a pitch roof and brickwork on the back will be beneficial for the area. According to the "Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement" in this area there is "*a greater variety of buildings. This is particularly true in Chetwynd Road, Spencer Rise and Churchill Road where there are small groups of buildings in the same street, often with only subtle variations of style or height between them. However they are still bound together by the use of the same materials and detailing.*"

It is to be considered that both roof and back façade are visible. According to the "Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement" "*The impact of the steeply rising street makes the roofscape highly visible.*" and "*The gaps on both sides of the road between buildings give important glimpses of rear gardens*".

#### 4.0 Planning Process

Before submitting the planning application we have developed the project consulting the neighbours, taking in account their comments to meet a satisfactory solution both for the clients and other resident of the area.

The concern for the possibility of overshadowing has been addressed with a sun simulation (attached). The sun simulation was supplied only to the neighbours and not part of the planning submission not being required for projects of this size.

Only when we achieved all neighbours' approval we proceeded with the planning submission to the Council on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2015.

On 15<sup>th</sup> May 2015, we were contacted by Tessa Craig, the Planning Officer responsible for our application. She informed us that our application was unlikely to be approved and offered the possibility to withdraw it but accepted to visit the property on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2015.

During the visit, the Planning Officer agreed with us the proposal was suitable for the area and asked additional drawings (attached side elevation) to submit to her manager and senior colleagues who unfortunately did not agree with our view and the planning was refused on 24<sup>th</sup> June 2015.

Upon receiving the refusal we decided to proceed with an appeal and we contacted the local councillors and neighbours to have their support.

#### 5.0 Appeal supporting arguments

- The rear elevation of the road is heterogeneous without a great difference of shapes and materials
- Design is sympathetic to the conservation area and we believe it would improve the property aesthetic which is not matching the area
- The proposed extension is not a speculative overbuilding but is required to meet minimum standards as suggested in many regulations and design guides. For example:

*Nationally Described Space Standard – Homes and Communities Agency 2014*

"GIAs for one storey dwellings include enough space for one bathroom and one additional WC (or shower room) in dwellings with 5 or more bedspaces"

*London Housing Design Guide August 2010*

"4.6 Bathrooms and WCs

4.6.1 Dwellings designed for an occupancy of five or more people should provide a minimum of one bathroom with WC and one additional WC."

- The extension is design to meliorate the property without private it of amenity space. The terrace will be still accessible and usable. The accessory space is design to allow full opening toward the terrace in order to maximise the external space.

- The local community is rather active and alert when new developments are proposed in the area but no objection was raised, and actually we received support from the neighbours whom were informed about the planning before submitting and provided with drawings.
- The planner officer who visited the property had a favourable view on the proposed planning, but after speaking with her manager and senior colleagues it was refused.
- It is the only property with a flat roof and rear elevation rendered. The proposed extension would be fitted with a pitch roof and brickwork exterior which we considered to be more suitable with the area.
- The proposal will not be visible from the road
- Planning approval was granted to the erection of an infill extension at 67A Chetwynd Road London NW5 1BX (ref. 2014/3651/P) which in our opinion has a greater impact on the area:
  - Visible from the street
  - Shape and materials not compatible with the conservation area
  - Received strong opposition from the local community

The Camden Planning Guide relevant points are:

4.10 Rear extensions should be designed to:

- be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- **respect and preserve the original design and proportions** of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- **respect and preserve existing architectural features**, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;
- respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;

4.12 In order for **new extensions to be subordinate to the original building**, their heights should **respect the existing pattern of rear extensions**, where they exist.

4.13 In most cases, extensions that are **higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level**, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, **will be strongly discouraged.**"

## 6.0 Supporting Documents

- Planning application drawings:
  - LP02 - Site Location Plan
  - LP03 - Site Photographs
  - EX01 - Existing First Floor Plan
  - EX02 - Existing Second Floor Plan
  - EX03 - Existing Front Elevation
  - EX04 - Existing Back Elevation
  - EX05 - Existing Section
  - PL01 - Proposed Second Floor Plan

- PL02 - Proposed Back Elevation
- PL03 - Proposed Section

- Additional drawing requested by the planning officer:

- EX06 - Existing Side Elevation
- PL04 - Proposed Side Elevation

- Sun Simulation supplied to the neighbours:

- SU01 - Summer Solstice
- SU02 - Equinox
- SU03 - Winter Solstice

- Photos of the rear.

- Planning Refusal.

- Councillor supporting letter

- Planning at 67A Chetwynd Road

- Photo of the front elevation
- Planning Drawing of front elevation