

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		03/11/2016	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		03/10/2016	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Kristina Smith				2016/4728/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
23 Healey Street London NW1 8SR				E00; E01; E02; E03; P01 (Rev F); P01 (Rev F); P02 (Rev E); P03 (Rev F); Design & Access Statement (August 2016)			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of two storey rear extension, replacement of uPVC windows with timber framed units and installation of roof lights in main roof							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refused					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	02	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00	
			No. electronic	00			
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	No responses received						
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	N/A						

## Site Description

The application site is located on the east side of Healey Street and has a rear garden that can be accessed from Grafton Crescent. The property is a mid-terrace three storey building with an original valley roof. It has been extended to the rear at ground floor level however the first floor level remains intact, as with most properties along this side of Healey Street. The rear elevations of the properties are highly visible from Grafton Crescent.

The building is not listed, nor is it located within a conservation area.

## Relevant History

### APPLICATION SITE

**2016/1596/P** - Erection of a third floor roof extension to create additional accommodation. **Refused 22/07/2016** on the grounds that:

- The proposed roof extension, due to its bulk, height, detailed design and location within a terrace of unbroken rooflines, would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building and streetscene

#### Appeal Dismissed on 09/09/2016

The Inspector commented that the proposed mansard roof extension is not an appropriate form of development for this location and the need to provide a larger family home is not sufficient to outweigh the harm identified. The Inspector drew attention to the pattern of valley roofs which are visually exposed within Grafton Crescent.

**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**

**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 03/03/2016**

### 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**

#### Appeal Allowed on 19/07/2016

### 25 HEALEY STREET

**G11/24/10/17475/R** - The change of use of 25 Healey Street, N.W.1 to provide a ground floor flat and a maisonette, including works of conversion, and the erection of a first floor rear extension. **Conditional 27/02/1974**

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

### NPPF 2012 (National Planning Policy Framework)

### London Plan 2016

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 – Securing high quality design

## **Camden Planning Guidance 2015**

CPG1 – Design 2015 sections 4.9 – 4.15

CPG6 – Amenity 2011 sections 6.1 – 6.18 & 7.1 – 7.11

### **Assessment**

#### **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 Planning permission is sought to demolish the original closet wing and erect a two storey full-width rear extension. The extension would measure 6m high by 5.7m wide with a depth of 4m at ground floor level and 2.6m at first floor level.

1.2 This application follows an extant permission (2016/1593/P) for a two storey rear extension which retains the closet wing and has a reduced depth at first floor level.

1.3 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Design
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

#### **2.0 Design and Appearance**

- Erection of two storey rear extension

2.1 The Council's Development Plan Policy DP24 requires all developments to respect the character, setting, context and proportions of the existing buildings when considering extensions. Section 24.7 continues this theme stating that development should respect:

- Character and constraints of its site;
- The prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- The impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape

2.2 More specific guidance in paragraph 4.10 of CPG1 (Design) states that ground floor rear extensions should respect and preserve the existing architectural features and respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space. The proposed extension is considered unacceptable as it would remove the original closet wing and would harm the historic pattern of rear development by introducing excessive bulk at first floor level.

2.3 In terms of the location and scale of development, paragraph 4.12 states that ground floor rear extensions are preferable to those at higher levels while paragraph 4.14 of CPG1 advises that the width of rear extensions should respect the rhythm of existing rear extensions. It is not considered that the proposal complies with either of these guidelines.

2.4 The terrace of which the application site forms a part of is highly visible from Grafton Crescent and the gardens and rear boundary walls back directly on to the street. The original pitched roof closet wing at first floor level is an intrinsic feature of the rear elevation along the terrace undoubtedly contributes to the character and appearance of Grafton Crescent. Whereas the extant permission retained the appearance of the closet wing by setting back the first floor extension behind it, this application proposes to remove it entirely.

2.5 Of the building group, only the adjoining property at no.25 Healey Street has a two storey full width extension which appears bulky, out of character and ultimately harmful to the architectural style of the host property. It is worth noting that the extension was granted in 1974, under previous policy

guidance. The existing harm caused by this extension cannot be used as justification for the further harm that an extension on the scale at the application site would result in. It is considered that the cumulative impact of two adjoining full width extensions at first floor level would be more than the sum of its parts by reason of the continued bulk at this level.

2.6 The adjoining property at no.21 Healey Street has an extant permission (2015/6097/P) for a ground and first floor rear extension that remodels the rear elevation with a contemporary appearance. The proposal seeks to re-provide the closet wing in recognition of its character and importance to both the building and the wider terrace.

2.7 In terms of detailed design the extension proposes contemporary full length windows at first floor level with glazed sliding doors at ground floor level. Brickwork to match the host property is proposed with part of it incorporating a 'perforated' effect to add visual interest. Although the detailed design is high quality and respects the existing fenestration of the property, it is not sufficient to overcome the 'in principle' issue concerning the introduction of bulk in this level.

- Replacement of uPVC windows and installation of rooflights

2.8 The replacement of UPVC with timber windows is considered a positive alteration to the host dwelling that would enhance its appearance. This element of the proposal is therefore supported.

2.9 The installation of five rooflights to the valley roof, while excessive, is considered an acceptable alteration given that they would not be visible from anywhere.

### **3.0 Amenity**

3.1 By virtue of the nature and location of the works, there would be no adverse impacts on the amenity of surrounding occupiers as the extension would infill the area between an existing extension and the original closet wing.

### **4.0 Recommendation**

4.1 Refuse planning permission