

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2016/2511/P

Case Officer:

Robert Lester

Application Address:

Flat A
17 Howitt Road
London
NW3 4LT

Proposal(s)

Construction of a single storey rear extension with rooflight, alterations to the roof of the existing rear extension, replacement windows and internal alterations.

Amended Plans

Amended plans were received on this application showing a reduction in the depth of the rear extension to 3.5 m and a change in its design to a lightweight glazed structure. The roof of the existing outrigger would be altered to form a flat roof with parapet. The proposed replacement sash windows at ground floor level would now have a simple double glazed timber sash design.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	18	No. of responses	4 (2 of which are from the same address).	No. of objections No of comments No of support	2 0 1
Summary of representations <i>(Officer response(s) in italics)</i>	<u>Objections to Original Plans</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The extension of the building 1m beyond the established building line would make for an incongruous form of development, contrary to DP24 of the Council's Development Management. The Belsize Conservation Area Statement (para. BE22) explains that "extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Some rear extensions, although not widely 					

visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced. Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the Conservation Area.” The proposed extension is harmful in this regard in particular by extending beyond the established building line.

Response: The amended plans show that the extension would no longer extend beyond the building line of the rear outrigger. It is considered that the extension (as amended) is a modest addition which would not alter the balance or harmony of the property or group of properties. The extension would no longer project beyond the existing outrigger and therefore the scale of the extension is considered to be adequately subordinate to the subject property. The extension would have a glazed lightweight appearance which would complement the existing brick built outrigger.

2. The proposal involves the infill of the side return at the property, which flies in the face of the guidance within the Conservation Area Statement. Para. BE23 states that “Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings. The acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances.” More fundamentally, BE24 explains that “The infilling of yards and rear spaces between buildings will generally be unacceptable.” We consider that the proposed extension is contrary to both these paragraphs.

Response: The amended plans show that the extension would no longer wrap-around the side/rear of the outrigger. The extension would therefore respect the layout and form of the existing property including the integrity of the existing rear outrigger. The extension is not considered to be a large addition to the existing property and the majority of the rear yard would be retained. Therefore, it is considered that the extension would not be in conflict with paragraph BE24 of the Conservation Area Appraisal. There have been several similar infill extensions granted on Howitt Road in recent years including the extension at 48a Howitt Road (2013/8123/P) which was for a similar extension (rear infill and alteration to the roof of the existing outrigger), 28A Howitt Road (2013/8094/P) which was also for a similar extension (rear infill) and 21 Howitt Road (2013/2661/P) which was for the demolition of the existing rear outrigger and its replacement with a full width rear extension plus basement level.

3. The proposal involves the alteration of the existing roof line at the property, which also flies in the face of the above guidance.

Response: A response to this point is provided under point 6 below.

4. The rearward extension by 1m would have an adverse impact upon the natural light and outlook received by neighbouring properties contrary to policy DP26 of the Council’s Development Management Policies.

Response: Agreed, the originally proposed 4 m deep rear extension would have had some amenity impact by reason of loss of light and increased enclosure. However, the proposed rear extension has been reduced in depth and the roof design has been changed, which would minimise the amenity impact in accordance with policy DP26.

5. The applicant is seeking to create a two bedroom flat as part of the proposal, which would require 70sqm floorspace to accord with the Council's minimum size standards. The current proposal (from our calculations) measures approx. 90sqm in size. Should the Council accept the infilling of the side return, there is still no reason for the proposal to extend an additional 1m from the established building line. If this was set back to align with the existing, building line from our calculations the flat would still comply with the overall size standards and individual room standards.

Response: The amended plans have reduced the extension by 1 m aligned with the existing outrigger.

Amended Plans:

Objections to Amended Plans

6. Objection to the flat roof (in place of the existing sloping roof) over the existing building at the rear of the property. The existing roof line is in keeping with the form and character of the rear of other properties, on Howitt Road and should be maintained. The proposed alteration to the existing roof line of the existing building at the rear of the property is contrary to Council policy for a number of reasons, in particular. The Belsize Conservation Area Statement (Para. BE22) explains that "extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced. Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive. Para. BE23 states that "Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings.

Response: The roof of the existing outrigger is being changed from a side facing mono-pitch to a flat roof set behind side/rear parapet in order to provide increased internal headroom. It is acknowledged that this would alter the appearance of the existing roof at the rear of the property. However, this alteration would not substantially alter the scale or form of the existing outrigger or harm the appearance of the conservation area. The Conservation Officer has reviewed the proposal and has no objection on the basis of the impact on the Conservation Area. There is variation in the roof design of the outriggers along Howitt Road (see point 2 above). It is therefore not considered that the extension would harm the character of the

conservation area.

7. If the Council is minded to accept the alteration to the existing roof line of the existing building at the rear of the property, then the resulting roof should be an "eco-friendly" or "living roof".

Response: A green roof is not required on this scale of development.

8. A condition should be placed upon the approval preventing the use of any part the roof of the existing or new extension to the rear of the building as a terrace.

Response: Agreed.

Recommendation:- Grant planning permission