

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		23/12/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		22/11/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Charlotte Meynell				2016/5610/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
185 Sumatra Road London NW6 1PF				1313-01; 1313-02; 1313-03; 1313-04; 1313-05			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of roof extension to rear two storey extension.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed on 01/11/2016 which expired on 22/11/2016. No consultation responses were received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		No comments received.					

Site Description

The application site comprises a two storey plus basement property situated on the southern side of Sumatra Road backing onto the railway lines. It is located within close proximity to West Hampstead Thameslink. The property is currently in use as an HMO.

The building is not listed and the site does not fall within a conservation area.

Relevant History

No pre-application advice was sought prior to this application.

2005/3531/P – Erection of a two storey rear extension to provide additional accommodation to a House in Multiple Occupation. **Granted 26/10/2005**

2004/5524/P – The erection of a 3-storey rear extension. **Withdrawn 07/02/2005**

2003/3214/P – Excavation of basement together with insertion of 3 windows to the front elevations in connection with the formation of a one-bedroom self-contained flat at lower ground floor. **Granted subject to a S106 Agreement 01/11/2004**

Relevant policies

National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF) (2012)

National Planning Policy Guidance (2014)

London Plan (2016)

Local Development Framework

Core Strategy Policies (2010)

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

Development Plan Policies (2010)

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Supplementary Guidance

CPG1 (Design) (2015)

CPG6 (Amenity) (2011)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal:

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought to raise the height of the existing two storey rear extension by 2.565m to create a mansard roof extension above featuring one rear dormer, one east facing dormer and one west facing dormer.
- 1.2 The proposed flat roofed mansard extension would adjoin the main roof to the rear but would be set 1.4m below the ridgeline. The roof extension would not be set in from eaves and would be clad in roof tiles to match the existing roof. The dormer windows would be 1.1m in height and would have a width of 1.0m to the side and 2.0m to the rear.

2.0 Assessment:

2.1 The principle considerations material to determining this application are as follows:

- Design (the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host property, as well as that of the wider area);
- Amenity (the impact of the proposal on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers).

3.0 Design and Appearance

- 3.1 Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards for developments. Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and respect the character, setting, form and scale of neighbouring properties, and the character and proportions of the existing building.
- 3.2 Rear extensions should be designed to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing. They should respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area in accordance with paragraph 4.10 of CPG1 (Design). CPG1 also states that extensions should be one storey below eaves level. In this case the existing two storey rear extension is currently one storey below eaves level, thus the proposal to raise the height and construct a mansard roof extension above does not comply with CPG advice.
- 3.3 The existing rear extension consumes a high proportion of the plot, projecting to the rear boundary wall, with a height of 5.6m and a width of 4.7m, which is half the width of the property. Whilst there is no consistent rear building line to the properties along this part of Sumatra Road, several neighbouring properties benefit from two storey rear extensions of a similar size to the existing extension at No. 185. The height of the proposal would add further to the dominance and visibility of the rear extension, and is considered to be an incongruous and bulky addition, which would dominate the rear elevation of the property and terrace as a whole.
- 3.4 In addition, the inappropriate extra bulk of the proposed mansard would be highly visible from the public realm from the pathway running between the rear of Sumatra Road and the trainline, and from West Hampstead Thameslink station, and is therefore considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area.
- 3.5 The proposal to install uPVC windows to the three dormers is also considered to be inappropriate, as it is contrary to paragraph 4.7 of CPG1 (Design), which states that uPVC windows are not acceptable for both aesthetic and environmental reasons.

4.0 Residential Amenity

- 4.1 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by stating that the Council will only grant permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight.

4.2 Paragraph 7.9 of CPG6 (Amenity) provides further clarity and guidance. *'When designing your development you should also ensure the proximity, size or cumulative effects of any structures do not have an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers'*.

4.3 It is considered that the proposal to raise the height of the existing two storey rear extension and erect a mansard roof with rear and side dormers above would add to the overbearing form of the extension, but not to the extent which would have a significant adverse effect on outlook from within the habitable rooms of neighbouring properties at No. 183 and No. 187 Sumatra Road.

4.4 The proposal includes one west side dormer and one east side dormer window. The side dormer windows would not have an adverse impact upon the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers in terms of increased overlooking or loss of privacy, as they would be obscured by opaque glass.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal would be a dominant and bulky addition that would detract from the appearance of the host building. It would be out of keeping with the scale, pattern of development, character and appearance of the rear elevations of buildings within this terrace and of the general streetscene.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Refuse planning permission.