Delegated Report			Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	07/07/2016				
			N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	17/03/2016				
Officer				Application Number(s)						
Oluwaseyi Enirayetan				2016/0845/P						
Application Address				Drawing Numbers						
5 Wilmot Plac	е									
London NW1 9JS				Refer to decision notice						
PO 3/4	Area Tea	m Signature	C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Signature					
Proposal(s)										
Erection of a single storey rear and side infill extension.										
Recommendation(s): Refuse Pla			ning Permiss	ion						
Application Type: Hous		Householde	useholder Application							

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	_ Refer to Draft Decision Notice								
Informatives:									
Consultations									
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	3	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	00			
			No. electronic	00					
	A site notice was displayed from 19/02/2016 to 11/03/2016 and a press notice was published 25/02/2016 and expired 17/03/2016.								
	A comment was received from No. 2 Rochester Terrace:								
	No. 5 Wilmot Place runs along the bottom of our back garden and we look out directly at it. We would have no objection in principle to the proposed extension, provided that:								
Summary of concultation	1) It is no higher, and preferably lower, than the existing structure it is intended to replace.								
Summary of consultation responses:	2) That it will not block sunshine in our garden, which faces south- west.								
	3) The wall of the proposed extension facing our garden does not contain any windows.								
	It is impossible to know from the architects' drawings accompanying the application what the answers to these questions are. We and other neighbours have also tried to contact the owner of 5 Wilmot Place to discuss details of the plans are but he has failed to respond. Until and unless we receive clarification, we cannot say with certainty that we will not object to the plans.								
	existing two storey ex	xtension borders no. 3, the							
CAAC/Local groups*	Rochester Conservation Area Advisory Committee objected on the following grounds;								
comments: *Please Specify	 Extension into the garden will cause a reduction of the garden Extension would rise above the existing garden walls Full width sliding door would be out of character Existence of boundary wall not shown in photographs 								

Site Description

The site is on the west side of Wilmot Place near the intersection with Rochester Place and within the Rochester Conservation Area. The building is one of a semi-detached pair (4 and 5 Wilmot Place) and is a three storey single dwelling-house. The building is not listed.

Relevant History

H12/2/6/27889 - Erection of garage on land at the rear of Nos. 4 and 5 Wilmot Place, St. Pancras, and formation of new means of access to Rochester Place – **Granted** 18/05/1962

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan March 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity)

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) July 2015; Chapter 2 – Design excellence Chapter 3 - Heritage Chapter 4 - Extension, alterations and conservatories

CPG6 (Amenity) September 2011;

Chapter 6 – Daylight and sunlight

Chapter 7 – Overlooking, privacy and outlook

Rochester Conservation Area Statement– adopted December 2001 – Rear

Extension/Conservatories R19 to R23, Side extensions R30 to R31 and Trees and Landscaping Design R33 to R36.

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought to erect a single storey rear and side infill extension.

1.2 The proposal has been revised since initial submission, but further revision has been sought to improve the design of the proposal, but no response has been received.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are:

- a) The design and impact on the appearance of the host building and the character and appearance of the conservation area; and
- b) Neighbour amenity.

Design/Impact on Conservation Area

2.2 Policy DP24 requires that all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, will be expected to consider:

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.

2.3 Policy DP25 also notes that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area.

2.4 With regards to rear extensions, CPG1 (Design) sets out a number of criteria that rear extensions should accord with. The relevant points include:

- It must be secondary to the host building in scale and proportion;
- Respect and preserve the architectural period and style;
- Respect and preserve the historic pattern of the surrounding area;
- Not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties;
- Allow for the retention of a reasonably sized garden (or amenity space).

2.5 Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERR) 2013.

2.6 The Rochester Conservation Area Statement states that No's 4 and 5 are modest properties and makes a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. One of current issues identified by the Rochester Conservation area is design: where development detracts from the character and appearance of the Conservation area through lack of respect for historic context such as inappropriate bulk, massing and/or height and inappropriate extensions, (Pages 21 and 22). Furthermore, it states in R20 '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'.

2.7 The extension would be 3m high, 5.25m wide (full width) and 1.75m deep beyond the existing rear

extension (existing extension is 4.8m deep). The extension would be 6.5m from the original rear elevation of the property. The party garden wall with adjoining property at No. 4 Wilmot Place would be built up and the space between the existing rear extension and the built up party wall would be glazed over with glass rooflight. The extension would be constructed in reclaimed yellow stock brick with aluminium sliding doors and a painted timber sliding sash window.

2.8 Full width extensions are generally resisted by CPG1 (Design) to ensure they are secondary to the host building. In terms of footprint, the extension would not be subordinate to the host building, and would be considered over development in this instance. The massing of the proposed extension would create a structure which would be read as a dominant addition to the host building towards the rear elevation and would fail to respect the pattern, character and setting of the host building and Conservation Area.

2.9 It is stated in the design and access statement that the rear garden is well concealed by adjoining buildings and trees and would be hard to see the extension from adjoining properties, let alone the public realm. The proposed works located to the rear of the property would be seen to some degree from surrounding area. However, the character of the conservation derives from the buildings, layout and surrounding spaces as a whole, regardless of whether particular elements are open to the public view. Furthermore, the rear garden amenity space would be considerably reduced in area. This would thus cause harm to the character and appearance of this part of the Conservation Area.

2.10 It is considered that the depth, height and width of the rear extension are overly large and unsympathetic with the host building. The patio sliding door details do not reflect the materials of the main building, however, the sash window does. The side infill extension is acceptable, but the overall proposed extension is considered an incongruous feature which would not fit the context of the host building and would therefore be detrimental to the character of the conservation area. The proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of design and bulk.

Amenity

2.5 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree."

2.6 There are 2 windows on the side elevation of adjoining property at No. 4 Wilmot Place. The party garden wall would be built up which would result in the loss of daylight and sense of enclosure to these windows, but as there are French doors facing the garden the room would continue to receive adequate daylight.

3.0 Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

3.1 The proposal is considered an overly dominant and large extension, with poor design unsympathetic to the host building and the character of the conservation area. The proposal is inconsistent with the policies and guidance identified above and is therefore recommended for refusal on design and amenity grounds.