

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		11/05/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		28/04/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Darlene Dike				2016/1473/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
Garden Flat 26 Healey Street London NW1 8SR				Please refer to decision notice.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of single storey rear extension.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	08	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>No site notice was displayed nor press notice published as the site does not fall within a conservation area, and the application does not qualify in any other way for publicity of this kind.</p> <p>No responses were received from adjoining occupiers.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		No responses were received from local amenity groups.					

Site Description

The site comprises a three storey terraced building, currently divided in to 2 self-contained flats, located on the west side of Healey Street, close to the junction with Castle Road.

The property with which this application is concerned is the Garden Flat situated on the ground floor, which features an existing part width, single storey rear extension currently housing the kitchen, as well as an original two storey closet wing in which the bathroom is located at ground floor level.

The site is not located in a conservation area and is not listed.

Relevant History

APPLICATION SITE

No relevant history.

NEIGHBOURING SITES

1 Healey Street (Lower Ground Floor)

2012/2815/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor (Class C3). **Granted 01/08/2012**

14 Healey Street

2007/1873/P - Demolition of existing rear two storey extension and conservatory and erection of a part 1/part 2 storey extension with first floor roof terrace to rear of single family dwelling house (C3). **Granted 11/06/2007**

16 Healey Street

2014/4400/P - Erection of a mansard roof and rear extension at ground floor level, installation of glazed balustrade and glazed screening, and replacement of existing window with door for the provision of a roof terrace at first floor level. **Granted 16/09/2014.**

2016/1839/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension and part 1 part 2 storey rear extension with 1st floor roof terrace, plus associated access door, balustrade and screening. **Granted 03/06/2016.**

21 Healey Street

2015/6097/P - Erection of a mansard roof extension. Demolition of existing part single, part two storey rear extension and erection of ground floor rear extension with roof terrace above (at first floor) and erection of first floor part width rear extension. **Refused 04/02/2016 and subsequently allowed on appeal on 19/07/2016.**

23 Healey Street

2015/6912/P - Erection of a two storey rear extension, first floor rear terrace, insertion of roof lights, replace the second floor rear UPVC window with a timber frame and converting the first floor rear window to a door. **Granted 01/03/2016.**

2016/1593/P - Demolition of existing single storey extension, creation of two storey rear extension, and addition of timber sash window in the closet wing. **Granted 23/05/2016.**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan 2016

Camden LDF Core Strategy 2010

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Camden Development Policies 2010

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2013

CPG1 Design – Chapter 4

CPG6 Amenity – Chapters 6 and 7

Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan – Adopted June 2016

Policy D3: Design Principles

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension. This is proposed to infill and extend beyond the void created between an existing part width single storey rear extension and the building's original closet wing.

2. Assessment

- 2.1 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:
- Design (Visual Impact)
 - Amenity (Impact on the amenity of adjoining neighbours)

3. Design

Principle

- 3.1 It is acknowledged that several permissions have been granted for rear extensions along Healey Street, namely at numbers 1, 14, 16, 21 and 23 (see relevant history), with some being significantly larger than that proposed under this scheme, making it reasonable to conclude that there is an established pattern of a mix of rear additions along the street.
- 3.2 It is important to note however, that the permissions granted were for sites with far more sizeable rear gardens than 26 Healey Street, either because these gardens had not previously been extended in to or because the pattern of the street is such that plots become less deep as the street numbers ascend, and so where properties close to the top and centre of the terrace feature quite generous gardens, these diminish in size towards the south of the street.
- 3.3 Being the penultimate property on its side of the terrace, 26 Healey Street is almost the southernmost building on the street, and consequently features one of its smallest gardens. The application property has already been extended in the past. Even without an existing extension present the rear garden amenity space would be very modest in size. Introducing a further extension into this limited space would compromise the ratio of built to unbuilt space in the terrace, and fail to retain the open character of 26 Healey Street, proportionate to the remainder of the terrace, by diminishing what little open rear garden space there is at this southernmost end of the street.
- 3.4 This would be contrary to CPG1 Design guidance which makes clear that extensions must 'respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space' (paragraph 4.10) and 'retain the open character of existing natural landscaping and garden amenity... proportionate to that of the surrounding area' (paragraph 41.0). Given the immediate constraints and context of the site at 26 Healey Street, an extension of the type proposed would not be acceptable in principle. Consequently, the broader pattern of development present in the street, which is for a mix of additions at the rear, cannot be further applied to 26 Healey Street to allow even greater depth of rear extension. In this context, in line with Council policy DP24 'past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions' (paragraph 24.13).

Context

- 3.5 DP24 also stipulates that all development should 'consider the character and constraints of its site' (paragraph 24.7), a point re-iterated where it states that 'given the highly built up nature of Camden, careful consideration of the characteristics of a site... is needed in order to achieve high quality development which integrates into its surroundings' (paragraph 24.11). The Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan Policy D3: Design Principles explains that 'proposals must be based on a comprehensive understanding of the site and its context' (page 22). It is felt that by proposing an additional rear extension, the particular position of the site within the terrace and the constraint that this poses in relation to the host property's limited garden size has not been duly factored within proposals, and consequently the scheme does not adequately address the characteristics of the site and its context.

Scale and Situation

- 3.6 The site features a closet wing, which though an original feature of the terrace makes an indent in to the garden space. This is added to by a previous non-original part width extension that does not simply sit in the void beside the closet wing but extends by a depth of 1.7m beyond it, and by a total of 3.9m beyond the original rear building line,

leaving a garden with a depth of just between 4.1m and 5.6m. Whilst the proposed extension is in and of itself modest, measuring 2.1m in width, by 3.7m depth and with a height of 2.5m, its cumulative impact alongside the existing extension and closet wing would be unacceptable.

Council policy DP24 makes clear that 'overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions' and that 'extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation' (paragraph 24.13). Taken in isolation the proposed extension would be subordinate in terms of its scale, as it is acknowledged that it alone would not add significant volume to the rear. However when combined with the existing rear extension the overall volume of non-original space created at the rear would be approximately 53m³, which would no longer be subordinate to the host building or appropriate for the plot on which it sits.

The proposed extension would be situated such that it is an adjunct to an already extended rear, and as such fall contrary to CPG1 Design guidance as it cannot 'be secondary to the building being extended in terms of location' (paragraph 4.10). DP24 within its opening paragraph makes clear that 'the Council...will expect developments to consider... the character and proportions of the existing building where alterations and extensions are proposed', but by proposing what is essentially overdevelopment at the rear, the scheme clearly fails to achieve this. Because of its footprint, the proposed extension would also fail to allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden, in line with CPG1 guidance (paragraph 4.10). The current garden measures 25.4m², and would measure 18.6m² following proposals, a decrease of almost 30%, which is not insubstantial. For this reason also, the scheme is unacceptable.

Detailed Design

- 3.7 The proposal is unacceptable too in terms of its detailed design. DP24 in its opening paragraph stipulates that *'the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design'* and this is furthered by the opening paragraph of CPG1 Design: Chapter 4 which states that *'alterations should always take in to account the character and design of the property'* and the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan: Policy D3 Design Principles which adds that for *'applications for the development of new and redevelopment of existing buildings(which may include demolition, alteration, extension or refurbishment)...design proposals must be of the highest quality'* (page 22). In proposing an ad hoc addition to the rear that does not respect the original building form the scheme fails on these points.
- 3.8 The proposed single storey rear extension would awkwardly meet the two existing protrusions at the rear – the original closet wing and existing single storey extension. It would not simply infill the void between these two elements, which would be a neat solution in terms of design (albeit one that perhaps prohibitively reduces the floorspace achieved). Instead it would protrude beyond them significantly, creating an addition that poorly relates to the remainder of the building. CPG1 advises that *'rear extensions should be designed to be secondary to the building being extended in terms of ...form'* (paragraph 4.10). By siting a further element with a flat roof against the tall column like element of the closet wing and adjacent to the mono-pitched roof of the existing single storey extension, the proposals do not adhere to this guidance.
- 3.9 The proposed and existing elements at the rear would not sit alongside each other cohesively as none of the elements relate to or complement one another, and so the proposed extension would appear as a juxtaposed addition. This is particularly the case in relation to the closet wing which it would abut, an original feature whose architectural integrity ought to be preserved, in line with CPG1 guidance for rear extensions to 'respect and preserve existing architectural features' and 'respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style' (paragraph 4.10). In failing to do this, the proposed extension would create an uneasy relationship with the rear, and very much fall into the category discouraged in CPG1 of 'rear extensions that are insensitively or inappropriate designed' that 'can spoil the appearance of a property' (paragraph 4.9).

4. Amenity

- 4.1 CPG1 Design sets out that proposed developments should *'not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking and sense of enclosure'*. 24 Healey Street features a single storey rear extension in the void created by its closet wing, with windows facing directly out to the garden at the rear. This is currently divided from 26 Healey Street by a modest boundary wall topped with trellis. The proposals would replace the trellis element with a solid wall in brick to a depth of

approx. 2m from the rear elevation of no 24. formed by the side elevation of the new extension, and add to this by placing a parapet wall atop the extension. By replacing what was formerly a permeable trellis with solid material and adding to the boundary's height, proposals create a more pronounced partition between to two properties that could hem in the rear aspect at 24 Healey Street and so contribute to a greater sense of enclosure here. In the context of very short rear gardens and the existing sense of enclosure within the rear spaces, it is considered that the projection on the rear boundary with number 24 would heighten the sense of enclosure experienced by occupiers of number 24, to an unacceptable degree. For this reason, the proposals are considered to be harmful to the amenity of neighbours grounds, contrary to policy DP26 and are refused on this basis

5. Recommendation

5.1 Refuse Planning Permission.