

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		12/12/2016	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		18/11/2016	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Charlotte Meynell				2016/5651/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
2 Hadley Street London NW1 8SS				See draft decision notice.			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a single storey rear and side infill extension.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
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 28/10/2016 which expired on 18/11/2016. No consultation responses were received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		No comments received.					

Site Description

The application site comprises a two storey mid-terrace property situated on the western side of Hadley Street backing onto the railway lines.

The building is on the Council's local list but the site does not fall within a conservation area.

Relevant History

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

2012/2053/NEW – Refurbishment of the existing host building and a new ground floor part single, part two storey rear/side extension. **Withdrawn 18/04/2012**

2011/4686/P – Erection of rear & side additions at ground, first and second floor levels to a single dwelling house (Class C3). **Refused 15/12/2011**

2011/2569/P – Erection of a 3 storey rear extension to existing house (Class C3). **Withdrawn 19/07/2011**

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 erect a single storey rear and side infill extension which would wrap-around the original two storey rear closet wing.
- 1.2 The proposed extension would be full width (5.1m wide), and would extend 2.5m forward of the rear elevation of the two storey closet wing, and 6.1m forward of the rear elevation of the main house. The extension would have an off-centre pitched roof, the ridgeline of which would align with the side elevation of the closet wing, and which would have a height of 2.7m at the boundaries rising to a height of 3.3m to the top of the ridgeline. The proposed floor level would be lowered so that the height of the extension would only be 2.3m from the floor level of the neighbouring gardens. The extension would be constructed in London stock brick with a slate roof and aluminium framed bi-folding doors and roof lights.
- 1.3 The proposal has been revised since the initial submission to set the rear elevation of the extension back by 0.5m and reconfigure the sizing and layout of the roof lights, however the revised proposals are not considered to have sufficiently addressed the design concerns raised.

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).
- 3.3 In terms of size and scale, the extension would not be subordinate to the host building, and would be considered over development in this instance. The proposal to lower the ground floor level to increase the internal floor to ceiling height would increase the height of the extension, and would create a structure that would be read as a dominant addition to the host building and would fail to respect the pattern, character and setting of the host building, contrary to the above policies and guidance.
- 3.4 Paragraph 4.10 of CPG1 (Design) advises that rear extensions should respect and preserve existing architectural features and the original design and proportions of the building. The proposed extension would wrap-around the original two storey closet wing and would extend 2.5m forward of its rear elevation, which would create an addition with a heavy appearance that is considered unsympathetic and out of keeping with the original architectural features of the host building, contrary to CPG1 guidance.
- 3.5 Two storey closet wings are the predominant feature of the rear building line along this side of Hadley Street, and whilst most properties benefit from either a single storey rear

extension built off of the closet wing, or a single storey side infill extension, the proposed full-width extension with a maximum depth of 6.1m and maximum height of 3.3m would be of a greater scale than any neighbouring extensions. The proposed extension would therefore be an incongruous addition which would dominate and disrupt the pattern and form of the rear building line of the terrace.

3.6 In addition, the inappropriate extra bulk of the proposed extension would be visible from the public realm from the raised trainline to the rear of the property, and would therefore be detrimental to the character and appearance of both the host property and the surrounding terrace.

3.7 Although the rear garden amenity space would be considerably reduced in area, it would still be considered to be of an adequate size for a useable space.

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 Due to the sunken location of the extension and the slope of the roof, at the boundary with no. 4 the extension would only measure 2.3m. While the extension would project 6.1m in depth, the height would be marginally above the permitted height of a boundary wall. On this basis, it is not considered that the proposed extension would significantly harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook or privacy.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposal is considered to detract from the appearance of the host building. It would be a dominant addition which would be out of keeping with the rear elevations of the host building and buildings within this terrace.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Refuse planning permission.