

APPEAL STATEMENT

77 Clarence Way, London, NW1 8DG

Construction of a 2-Storey extension in replacement
of existing extension

Greenhayes Planning Ltd

INTRODUCTION

1. This statement is submitted in relation to the refusal of the application, 2016/3171/P, which relates to the construction of a two storey extension at 77 Clarence Way, Camden, NW1 8DG which is a property set within an established terrace. The application was refused on the 1st September 2016 for the following reason;

The proposed extension, by virtue of its height, siting, scale and detailed design, would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host building, the adjoining terrace of buildings and the Harwood Street Conservation Area, contrary to Policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

2. It is understood from the officer's report and the wording of the decision notice that that the extension is, in the council's view, harmful to the host building, the wider terrace and the Conservation Area. This statement will demonstrate that the proposed extension is of a high quality design which will respect and complement the character of no.77 Clarence Way and will preserve the character of its surroundings including the Conservation Area and surrounding properties. It is noted the council do not raise any concern relating to any other matter including impact on amenity on neighbouring properties.

THE SITE AND PLANNING HISTORY

3. The site is an attractive mid-19th terraced property which is two storey with a stepped parapet roof above. The dwelling consists of timber sash windows, yellow stock brick and its front elevation, together with the wider terrace, form an attractive group of buildings which contribute to the character of the area. To the rear the building has a two storey wing which appears to date from the first part of the 20th Century (and thus although is not original to its construction, does form

part of the original dwelling as defined by the NPPF which is relevant to decision making). A modern infill single storey glazed extension sits within the space between this and the neighbouring two storey extension which appears to be of modern recent construction, containing modern UPVC windows and modern brickwork and bond.

4. The building is not listed but lies within Harmood Conservation Area. The front elevations of the terrace are those parts of the building which contribute to the significance of the conservation area but the rear elevations are unseen from public areas and thus offer little contribution. The rear of the appeal property is well screened from the rear gardens of properties in Hartland Road and thus views of the rear elevations are limited. Unlike the front elevations, the rear elevations of the properties do not have any resemblance of uniformity with properties having a varied mix of extensions including two storey extensions, in some cases across the majority of the rear elevation, and roof terraces. This does not present any uniformity of character and in some cases is not of high quality design. This variation can be seen in the aerial photograph and photographs attached as **Appendix 1**.

PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT SUBJECT OF APPEAL

5. The proposal seeks to construct a two storey extension in replacement of the existing single storey extension to create a home more akin to a family homes. This seeks to provide a master bedroom and en-suite at first floor and a new kitchen/utility room area on the ground floor along with alterations to the existing floorspace in order the property flows into the new extension. The openings for the 1st floor windows and ground floor doors are designed in order to respect the existing proportions of the property and the extension will be set down in height from the adjacent projections. The materials will be high quality zinc and dark grey metal in order to provide an attractive blend between the traditional character and

modern architecture. This will create a more spacious homes which is suitable for family living and which would reflect greater parity with the national space standards, in a manner consistent with the principles of good design

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY CONTEXT

6. The Development Plan for the Borough is made up of the council's LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies DPD 2010. This is supported by a range of supplementary documents including a document relating to Design which is referred to by the council. The relevant policies including those relating to design and heritage and those relating to minor householder extensions.
7. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration in decision making and is relevant to this application as this is capable of being a material consideration in the appeal. The NPPF states the role of the planning system should be the delivery of sustainable development which is made up of three distinct strands which are mutually dependent on one another. Planning should play a number of roles to deliver sustainable development which include economic, social and environmental roles which should be addressed together to deliver sustainable solutions through the planning system

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Context

8. The extension is proposed by the appellant in order to utilise an otherwise inefficiently used space to address the issue facing most Londoners, a lack of space and overcrowding in order to create a property more akin to a family home. In order to create additional space, it was decided to utilise the space between the two projections to the rear which is a discreet location largely unseen by any other property. This approach accords with the NPPF which encourages the efficient use of land and buildings and which conserve heritage assets in a way that is appropriate to their significance.

9. Whilst the scheme is not permitted development on account of the conservation area status (the depth of the extension is just beyond the 3m allowed under permitted development in other area), it is pertinent to reflect upon the government's view on supporting a homeowner's desire to improve their home. In one of the many ministerial statements which support home improvements, that of the 6th September 2012, the Secretary of State, stated the following;

'As a nation, we have great pride in our homes, and I want to make it easier for families to undertake home improvements: not just to cut red tape and strengthen individual homeowners' rights, but also to help generate economic activity which will support small traders in particular'

10. The benefits of the scheme in improving internal space to create a family home and the support set out by national government for homeowners in improving their home is relevant in this appeal and lies in support of the appeal proposal. The fact the scheme achieves this in manner consistent with good design and without harm to its surroundings is a further benefit. The appeal will now address the reasons for refusal below and will set out the case to why the scheme is considered acceptable in planning terms.

Impact on the host building and wider terrace

11. The council allege the extension would harm the character of the existing property by reason of the scale, design and detailing and that it would disrupt the rhythm of the existing rear elevations of the terrace. Within the officer report, it states the established character is of 2 storey half width closet wings as if this layout and appearance was a feature of the original design and construction of the properties. Firstly it is clear there is no such rhythm which one sometimes finds to the rear of historic properties which was created when the buildings were first constructed. Whilst there are two storey extensions along the terrace, these are not original and are a mix of 20th century additions, some even dating it would appear from the early 21st Century. For example, in the immediate context, the property to the east has a

modern two storey extension with UPVC windows and modern brickwork and to the west, the properties there have a varied mix of rear additions with various roof forms and design which do not present any consistent character to which new development should follow. The photographs of the immediate locality can be seen as **Appendix 1**. In any case, in most areas across London, it is common to find a mix of extensions and alterations, even in conservation areas, on rear elevations, as such areas are not visible and with the need for space in London, innovative solutions are found.

12. Within this context of variation and privacy, the extension seeks to blend modern with traditional architecture which provides an attractive contrast in terms of materials and form. This is a technique which is employed with success across the country and in particular within London and is usually preferable to employing the 'pastiche approach' through the replication of the design and materials of the existing building. A photograph of modern architecture to the rear of the appeal site with sits with this traditional context is attached as **Appendix 2**. The important elements of a development include the quality of materials, the need to follow the proportions of the host building and that it appears subservient in order one can still read the building in architectural terms.
13. In this case, the extension has taken its cue from the existing building by its aligning its openings with the level of the existing windows in order to create horizontal consistency. The blending of dark grey matt metal with the yellow stock brick is attractive and pleasing to the eye and thus in terms of proportions and detail is considered to represent a good quality design which is appropriate to the main property and would be in accordance with policy CS14 and DP24.
14. The matter of scale has also been carefully considered as the extension is set down below the neighbouring projections (on the appeal property and the neighbouring property) and is set back in terms of its depth in order it appears subservient to these two neighbouring buildings. This approach accords with council's design

policy, Supplementary Design Guidance SPG1;Design which sets out the council's approach to residential extensions. This states in respect of two storey rear extensions, *'extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged.'* The use of the word 'or' implies that if an extension does not exceed one element, it will accord with the guidance. The council have quoted the first part in the refusal but have ignored the second part which supports extensions where they do not rise above the general height of the neighbouring projections. The extension subject of this appeal accords with the second part of the guidance.

15. This in addition to the different palette of the material will enable one to read the evolution of the building and which reduces the visual impact of the massing of the building. When viewed from the garden of the appeal property, the extension will not dominate the rear elevation of the property as it will be set lower, between existing projections, and by way of its contrasting appearance will break up the visual context of the rear elevation. If however, the extension had been proposed in matching brick there would be visual mass of brick whereas the contrast offered by the chosen material softens and breaks up the rear elevation into vertical elements. The lower height of the extension and its set back from the rear elevation also helps define the extension as a subservient infill addition. As set out above, in any case, the rear elevation of the terrace is not consistent and there are a variety of extensions within the vicinity of the appeal site and it is considered this scheme has the potential to raise design standards in the local area.

16. Aside from the good design principles employed in the scheme, the site is any case absent from any public views and most private views as its rear boundary has mature trees which limit views between the properties on Hartland Road which back onto the appeal site. Thus due to its contained position between two projections, its low key use of materials and simple proportions, it is very likely the only properties that could see the extension are the appeal property and the

properties either side, but only if the occupier walked to the rear of their garden. As a result, it is not clear how a discreet extension could possibly harm the character of the terrace or the host property. The council have also drawn attention to the obscuring of the chimney stack by the extension as an indication of further harm caused. However, the adjoining property extension has already obscured part of the stack as a result of its extension and due to the presence of two projections either side of this, views of this are extremely limited within and from outside of the appeal site. In any case, the appellant will be incorporating the stack into the internal layout of the scheme as an imposed feature in order this is preserved for future generations. Thus this loss of an external view (not the feature itself) will not cause significant harm.

17. The above assessment shows the development will not harm the character of the host building nor the wider terrace. This is on account of the simple proportions of the extension, the set back and lower height of the extension and its attractive blend of modern architecture within a discreet location of the dwelling. The variation in built form to the rear, none of which are original to the original construction and the well contained location, will allow the extension to blend in without harm to the wider terrace. Thus the scheme will comply with Section 7 of the NPPF and policies CS14 and DP24.

Impact on the Conservation Area

18. Within the wording of the decision notice, the council have alleged the development would be harmful to the character of the conservation area and stated the development would be contrary to the CS14 and DP25 which relate to heritage. As set out above, it is considered the development would be acceptable to the host dwelling and therefore would in turn preserve the character of the conservation area. Section 72 of the Listed Building and Conservation Area 1990 sets out the desirability of preserving or enhancing such areas for their special townscape character. This aim is reflected in policy DC25 which at the minimum requires

development to conserve the character which justified the designation of the conservation area in the first place.

19. The site lies within the Harmood Conservation Area (HCA) which was designated in 2005. The terrace in which the appeal site is located is discussed within the Harmood Conservation Area Statement (HCAS) and describes the terraces and their notable features visible in the street scene as those which contribute to the character of the HCA. It is notable and correct that these features are the quality and form of the front elevation of the buildings and their value as a larger group when viewed from the street. The statement also makes mention of their gardens and boundary walls and historic street lighting. The proposed extension will preserve these features and thus will also preserve the significance of the conservation area. This is particularly so as the rear of the property and its terraces cannot be seen from any public vantage point and its heavy boundary screening of mature trees in its rear gardens limit any views between properties and the rear elevation of the appeal property. Thus the development will not even effect view 'within' the conservation area.

20. It is also notable to reflect upon a passage within the HCAS which relates to the 'current issues' relating to Harmood Conservation Area which is on page 10 of the statement. This recognises there is pressure for rear extensions but states '*where these are positioned to the rear there is little or no impact on the conservation area as gardens are relatively private and screened from public viewpoints.*' Taking all factors into account it can confidently be stated the development will conserve the character of the conservation area in accordance with the relevant policies.

CONCLUSION

21. The scheme is considered to represent a high quality designed extension which is located on a discreet part of the dwelling and which will create an attractive blend of modern and traditional architecture. The appeal site is well contained and there are

no views from public vantage points or between properties and this will sit appropriately within the existing variation in built form to the private rear elevations of the terrace.

22. The extension will create an additional bedroom and a kitchen/dining area that is commensurate with family living and will address the lack of space suffered by the appellant. This extension will utilise an otherwise redundant space between two buildings and thus will make efficient and effective use of land to address the very matter facing most Londoners.

23. When the compliance with policy and the lack of harm is considered against the quality and benefits of the development it is considered the presumption in favour principle weighs in support of the scheme. It is therefore respectfully requested that the appeal is allowed.

Appendix 1





Rear view





View from back garden



View along rear of terrace to the east

Appendix 2



View of modern architecture from rear garden (also within conservation area)