

## **Grounds for appeal**

ref: 2015/6763/P

The decision notice states that proposal is unacceptable for the following reason: “...*size, location, scale and detailed design the proposed extension would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, the adjoining terrace of buildings and the Harmood Street conservation area*” -

### **Statement by appellant:**

The proposed extension cannot be seen from the public road and is contained discretely within a first floor “recess” of the existing rear massing of the property, directly above the kitchen. It is not visible from any other properties or public footpaths at the rear. In terms of the specific terms cited by the case officer I respond as follows -

*Size:* It is modest and respectful of context

*Location:* The first floor level location is immediately next to the main bedroom where the bathroom is much needed. There are no other options for location in the host property

*Scale:* the scale is appropriate and has been designed so as to be read as sub-ordinate to the host massing, in as much as it can be, without reducing the size of the bathroom and consequently compromising accessibility for the elderly people who will use it.

*Detailed design:* the design is simple and straightforward. It does not attempt to draw attention to itself, and uses high quality traditional materials and fittings such as lightweight framing, patinated blue-grey zinc roofing/cladding, triple glazed rooflights ( which aid natural ventilation give good

natural daylighting).

For this reason I contend that the proposal is well designed would not detract from the character or appearance of the conservation area.

### **Delegated report**

“ .... changing negatively the historical reading of the building...”:

The extension is set back from the face of the existing rear façade line by 300mm in order to distinguish the subordinate massing of the infill volume from the host building. It is set down by an average of 300mm at roof level (from the existing valley roof line) to the south and to the extension to the east to further distinguish the addition of new from old.

The extension provides urgently required functional accommodation and does so carefully without demolition of any of the historic fabric. In addition, the structure could be removed easily in the future (should that be necessary) without damaging or distorting the historical reading of the host building. Moreover, the existing sash window to the stair is retained intact, and in the new configuration it becomes a feature of interest that can be observed from both sides, with the added effect of the decorative glass being illuminated (onto the stair when light shines through) either from the rooflights during the day or from artificial light within the bathroom itself, at nighttime.

For these reasons, I contend that the proposal would not harm the host building or terrace.

### **Summary**

With small cottage style terraced houses like this, the scope for any expansion is limited, as families grow or circumstances change. In central London it is particularly difficult to move to larger houses as huge price increases have forced people to remain in their existing properties and therefore to be innovative and find solutions that can improve their situation.

The occupants/appellants are an elderly couple with reduced mobility and in need of an easier and more accessible bathroom situated close to the main bedroom (as would be the case with current accessibility requirements under Lifetime Homes guidance).

The proposal represents a sensitive way to adapt the existing property using traditional materials. Our brief to provide an ensuite bathroom off the main bedroom, has been addressed by the architect in a careful way that respects the historical importance of its context by proposing a massing that reads as secondary and additive, to the existing building. The proposal is not visible from the street or public footpath and it is a proposal which has received no objections from neighbouring residents, nor from the Harmood Street, Hartland Road and Clarence Way Residents' Association.

Bill Hoyland  
Appellant

July 30, 2016