

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	25/12/2015
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	25/12/2015
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Jennifer Chivers			2015/6100/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
The Coach House 102 Haverstock Hill London NW3 2BD			See Decision Notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Construction of mansard roof extension with associated alterations to the front and rear elevations.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>21</b>	No. of responses	<b>4</b>	No. of objections	<b>4</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>A site notice was erected from 24/07/2015 – 12/08/2015</p> <p>Objections have been received from the following addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Flat 4, 102 Havertsock Hill</li> <li>- 104E Haverstock Hill</li> <li>- Flat b, 104 Haverstock Hill</li> </ul> <p>The issues referred to in the objections are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The design is overbearing and not in keeping with the rest of the coach houses with in the parade which are one storey high above ground level only and as such will interrupt and distort the parade calm design rhythm.</li> <li>- With the extension the coach house will no longer look like an extension as it was initially designed to do. The proposal is very over power to 100 and 102 Haverstock Hill especially.</li> <li>- The straight line connection between the porch entrance height of 100 Haverstock through both coach houses which is a very pleasant line feature currently that should be maintained.</li> <li>- The proposed addition is too high.</li> <li>- The narrowness of the site is of such that an additional floor will take everything around the proposed development out of all proportions and will result in over intensification of the site in terms of density.</li> <li>- The conservation area strategy states that infill extensions should be no more than two storeys in height with the highest part of the extension no higher than the line of the cornice to the front porch.</li> <li>- The property at 102 is listed in the conservation strategy as a building that makes a positive contribution to the CA.</li> <li>- If approved it would signal the erosion of the existing street character, Camden's own policy guidelines and set an unwelcome precedent for the future.</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC comments:</b>	The Belsize park Conservation area advisory committee have objected to any increase in height to the extension.					

## **Site Description**

The host property is located on the north side of Haverstock hill within an infill extension known as the Coach House. The property was built in 1991 and set back from the road front and main building line.

The property lies within the Park Hill Conservation Area, but is not subject to any other designations. 102 Haverstock Hill is a positive contributor.

## **Relevant History**

2012/4134/P - Demolition of rear ground floor extension and construction of new ground floor rear extension, and alterations to front elevation of existing dwelling house (C3). Granted 08/10/2012

## **Relevant policies**

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

National Planning Policy Framework

The London Plan March 2015, consolidated with alterations since 2011.

### **Core Strategy**

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

### **Development Policies**

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG1 (Design) 2015 Chapter 1,2,4,5

CPG6 (Amenity) 2011 Chapter 1,6,7

Parkhill and Upper Park conservation area appraisal and management strategy 2011

## Assessment

### Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the demolition of the existing roof and replacement with a mansard roof extension with associated external alterations.

As part of the extension the rear parapet would be heightened.

The material considerations in assessment of this application are:

- Design
- Amenity

### Design

Development Policy DP24 takes into consideration amongst other things a) the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed.

Paragraph 24.13 expands on this and states that development should not undermine any existing uniformity of a street or ignore patterns or groupings over building. Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless, exceptionally, it is demonstrated that this is not appropriate given the specific circumstances of the building. Past alterations or extension to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals.

Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) states that a roof alteration is likely to be considered unacceptable in circumstances such as the presence of unbroken runs of valley roofs or where complete terraces or groups of buildings have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations and extensions and where the scale and proportions of the building would be overwhelmed by the additional extension. It adds that a roof addition is likely to be unacceptable where the proposal would have an adverse effect on the skyline, the appearance of the building or the surrounding street scene.

The host property is one of a group of similar side infill extensions (coach houses between 96 -110) within the parade. These extensions are one storey above ground level and set back behind the front façade of the principal Victorian Italianate buildings. While the infill extensions have been incremental with a variety of style and quality they can still be read as contemporary insertions with homogeneity of height, scale and size. These extensions are viewed as subordinate extensions to the main buildings.

The addition of a roof extension to the coach house would alter the uniformity of scale of these subordinate additions as well as compete for dominance with the attached principal building. The proposed roof extension would also appear as a bulky and incongruous addition to the existing coach house and would dominate the host building, overwhelming its original scale and simple form and design.

Para 4.17 of Camden Planning Guidance 1 - Design states that the infilling of gaps will not be considered acceptable where the architectural symmetry or integrity to a composition is impaired. Side extensions should be no higher than the porch. The proposal results in the side extension being a storey above the porch. Despite the proposed set back the extension would still be highly visible within the streetscape and would appear at odds with the general scale and pattern of development along this part of Haverstock Hill.

In addition, the detailed design of the extension necessitates an increase in the height of the front parapet, which would be taller than the adjoining parapet line. The proposed extension would also overhang onto the roof of the adjoining building. This would further disrupt the pattern and scale of development of these subordinate features in the street.

In this case, the principle of a roof extension on the host property is not accepted in this location for the reasons discussed above. For the reasons discussed above the development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the Parkhill and Upper Park conservation area and would fail to preserve or enhance the host property or the wider conservation area.

### Amenity

Policies CS5 and DP26 seek to protect the amenity of the Borough's residents from the harmful aspects of new development.

### *Daylight and Overlooking*

The additional floor at roof level, due to its location on top of the building, is not considered to affect daylight or sunlight to neighbouring properties. It is not anticipated that there will be any additional overlooking from the roof extension given the high level windows that are located at the rear of the existing dwelling.

### **Recommendation:** Refuse Planning Permission

The proposed mansard roof extension, by virtue of its height, bulk, mass and design would be an over dominant addition that would be out of keeping with the scale, character and appearance of the adjoining buildings and general street scene failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Park Hill Conservation area and would be contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.