

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>06/04/2016</b>
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>20/05/2016</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Numbers</b>	
Samir Benmbarek			2016/0748/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
40A Shoot-Up Hill London NW2 3QB			82/968/01; 82/968/03; 82/968/04; 82/968/05; 82/968/06; 82/968/07;	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Single storey rear extension and first floor roof extension to dwelling.				
<b>Recommendation:</b>	Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Householder Application			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>27</b>	No. of responses	<b>05</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>Neighbour consultation letters were sent to adjoining properties on 22 March 2016 with further letters sent to residents of Hillcrest Lodge (40 Shoot-Up Hill) on 08 April 2016. Four objections have been received from the following addresses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 Shoot-Up Hill/ Hillcrest Lodge</li> <li>• 40 Shoot-Up Hill/ Hillcrest Lodge</li> <li>• Flat 1, 40 Shoot-Up Hill/ Hillcrest Lodge</li> <li>• 36 Shoot-Up Hill</li> </ul> <p>The above have objected/commented on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliberate errors on the submitted documentation</li> <li>• The design of the proposal is aesthetically displeasing</li> <li>• Impacts of amenity by reason of overshadowing, overlooking and loss of privacy upon neighbouring occupiers</li> <li>• Frontage of 40A frontage insufficient to park a car</li> <li>• Application property is currently in use as nursery causing noise disturbance to neighbours which will be further exacerbated</li> <li>• Existing issues with waste and parking by 40A will be increased as a result of the proposal</li> <li>• Present plan is similar to one which was refused by the Council previously</li> </ul> <p>Officer's Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Upon site visit and further investigation, there appears to be discrepancies within the submitted documentation. Overall, this is not considered to contribute greatly to the recommended decision of a refusal.</i></li> <li>• <i>It is considered by the officer that the design, bulk and scale of the proposed roof additions are unacceptable. Please refer to Section 3.0</i></li> <li>• <i>It is considered by the officer that the proposal would cause adverse impacts towards neighbouring amenity in regards to overlooking and privacy. Please refer to paragraph 4.4.</i></li> <li>• <i>The officer has taken this matter into account, although it is not considered the proposal would alter this issue</i></li> <li>• <i>It is considered by the officer that the proposal would not result in an exacerbation of the applicant property as a nursery due to the minimal scale of the rear extension and the first floor addition is to be intended as a bedroom. Official procedure also applies from other parties regarding nursery administration and procedure.</i></li> <li>• <i>It is not considered by the officer existing issues with waste and parking may be exacerbated further due to the small amount of floorspace created in comparison to the existing floorspace. Parking concerns within the forecourt are a matter between the owners/occupiers of No. 40 and No.40A Shoot-Up Hill.</i></li> <li>• <i>The application will be determined in the same procedure as the existing application, applying the policies from the Local Development Framework.</i></li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/ National Amenity Society comments:</b>	N/A					

## Site Description

The application is related to a single storey property attached to the main building located on the eastern side of Shoot-Up Hill. The property is not located within a conservation area, nor is it Listed. The dwelling once formed part of No. 40 Shoot-Up Hill but was separated off as an independent unit in the 1990s. The application site is accessed via a shared driveway and the host property is restricted from public views.

Shoot-Up Hill is a main thoroughfare into Central London from Northwest London in which is surrounding area is predominantly residential. To the west of Shoot-Up Hill opposite the site is the London Borough of Brent.

## Relevant History

### No.40A Shoot-Up Hill (Application Building):

(Ref:TP/82508/5000) - Planning Permission granted on 28/06/1961 for construction of single storey extension to form maid's room and bathroom at the rear of No. 40 Shoot-Up Hill.

(Ref:P9600858R1)- Planning permission granted on 07/06/1996 for change of use from one self-contained flat to two self-contained flats at ground level.

(Ref: 2007/0220/P)- Planning application withdrawn on 09/03/2007 for the erection of a rear extension, plus a first floor level extension with sloping rear elevation over the existing flat roof to create additional accommodation for the single dwelling house.

(Ref: 2007/5761/P)- Planning permission was granted on 06/08/2008 for the erection of a single-storey rear ground floor level extension and addition of a pitched roof with 13 rooflights to the flat roof of the existing dwelling house. The permission was renewed (see 2010/0368/P)

(Ref: 2007/5759/P)- Planning permission was refused on 11/06/2008 for the erection of a ground floor single storey rear extension and addition of a part first floor extension to existing house to provide additional accommodation for the existing dwelling house, together with the addition of a pitched roof above the existing flat roof with rooflights. This application was dismissed at appeal via a public inquiry.

(Ref: 2010/0368/P)- Planning permission was granted on 19/04/2010 for alterations to pitched roof of extension, as an amendment to planning permission dated 30 July 2008 (ref:2007/5761/P) for the "erection of single-storey rear ground floor level extension and addition of a pitched roof with 13 rooflights to the flat roof of the existing dwelling house".

(Ref: 2013/0569/P)- Renewal of planning permission granted on 04/03/2013 for the alterations to pitched roof of extension, as an amendment to planning permission dated 30 July 2008 (ref:2007/5761/P) for the erection of single-storey rear ground floor level extension and addition of a pitched roof with 13 rooflights to the flat roof of the existing dwelling house.

### No. 40 Shoot- Up Hill

(Ref: 2012/2118/P)- Planning permission refused on 18/06/2012 for the erection of a single storey rear extension at first floor level with rooflight, new windows to north west elevation, replacement of existing balustrade to existing roof terrace at first floor level to residential flat (Class C3).

(Ref: 2012/2120/P)- Planning permission granted on 18/06/2012 for the excavation of a rear lightwell with skylight enclosed by low brick wall with balustrade to extend existing basement, replacement of rear door with sash window and insertion of new windows on north west elevation to ground floor flat (Class C3).

(Ref: 2013/1842/P)- Planning permission refused on 23/05/2013 for the erection of a single storey rear extension at first floor level with rooflight, new windows to north west elevation, replacement of existing balustrade to existing roof terrace at first floor level to residential flat (Class C3).

### No. 38 Shoot- Up Hill

No relevant planning application history

### No. 42 Shoot- Up Hill

No planning application history.

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

### The London Plan 2016

### LDF Core Strategy, 2010

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development )

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

### Camden Development Policies, 2010

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

### Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CGP1 Design (2015)

### Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015

Policy 2 (Design and character)

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension and first floor roof extension to ground floor dwelling.

1.2 The main issues for consideration are:

- The impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the host building and the surrounding area;
- The impact the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

### 2. Previous Planning Applications at No. 40A Shoot-Up Hill (Ref:2012/3020/P)

2.1 Planning permission for the erection of a single-storey ground rear ground floor extension and addition of a pitched roof with 13 rooflights to the flat roof of the existing dwelling house was granted on 06 June 2008. Subsequently, a 2x planning permission renewal applications were approved on 19 April 2010 and 23 May 2013 respectively. Both applications involved minor alterations within the proposal, mainly being the roof pitch and design.

2.2 Alongside application ref: 2007/5761/P, another application was submitted which was refused on 11 June 2008 for the erection of a ground floor single storey rear extension and addition of a part first floor extension to existing house to provide additional accommodation for the existing dwelling house, together with the addition of a pitched roof above the existing flat roof with rooflights (ref:2007/5759/P). This was subsequently dismissed at appeal on 31 March 2009 after a public inquiry.

### 3. Assessment of Impact on Host Building and Surrounding Area

3.1 Along the eastern side of Shoot-Up Hill, the buildings have been extended to the rear; however of these properties the development to the rear of 40 Shoot-Up Hill is more substantial in depth and width than that in the surrounding area. However, it should be noted that the plot that is occupied by 40 Shoot-Up Hill (and more recently the application building), is larger than the neighbouring plots.

3.2 Furthermore, within the immediate area, the pattern of the existing roofscape along the eastern side of Shoot-Up Hill has not been influenced by roof extensions and the group of buildings remain unaltered at roof level.

3.3 In regards to LDF policies, respecting the local character is an intrinsic aim. In particular, DP24 require careful consideration of the characteristics of the site, features of local distinctiveness, and the wider context to be demonstrated in order to achieve high quality development which integrates into its surroundings. Within areas of

distinctive character, it is considered development should reinforce those elements which create the character.

3.4 In considering the proposal against CPG1 (Design), rear extensions should be designed to:

- Be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- Not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure;
- Allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden; and
- Retain the open character of the existing natural landscaping and garden amenity, including that of neighbouring properties, proportionate to that of the surrounding area.

3.5 Within the preceding context, the rear extension is considered acceptable, given that the plot on which the building is located on plot which allows the retention of a reasonable sized garden (separated from the plot of No. 40), is of a scale that is secondary to the host building and retains the open character of the rear of the dwellings along Shoot-Up Hill and Fordwych Road.

3.6 The detailed design of the proposed rear extension is considered appropriate. It will be constructed of stock brick to match the existing building. The proposed extension is considered to be lightweight in its appearance. As the extension is located at the rear of the building, it will not be viewed from public realm (in addition to the front of the property having restricted public views) therefore not affecting the streetscene.

3.7 In regards to the roof extension, the proposal is identical to the proposal at first floor level to the application building within planning application ref: 2007/5759/P which was refused and dismissed on appeal. At the front of the building, the proposal includes an additional at first floor level in a mansard style to accommodate an extra bedroom and bathroom. To the rear, the proposal includes the addition of a pitched roof with roof lights to the existing flat roof of the host property. The pitched roof element will not facilitate any living accommodation.

3.8 It is not considered appropriate to provide an additional storey at first floor level in the context of the surrounding built form, the relationship between No. 40 and No. 40A and in addition the poor detailed design. The proposal is not considered to comply with the intrinsic aims of DP24 (discussed in paragraph 3.3).

3.9 The proposed 'mansard' style addition at the front of the site would read as a full new storey to the host building. As discussed above, the properties along Shoot-Up Hill have generally been extended to the rear. However the entire host building (No. 40 and No.40A) has been extended (No. 40A was originally an extension of No. 40) substantially in its width and depth. To provide an additional storey would create a dominant feature and would alter the relationship between No. 40 and No.40A where No. 40A read as an ancillary building subservient to No. 40. It would also increase the prominence of No. 40A as viewed from the streetscene and surrounding properties; it would present as an unduly large and unbalanced composition of the entire host building.

3.10 While the principle of an additional level is not considered to be appropriate, the detailed design is considered to be poor that would be incongruous with the host building and heighten further the prominence of the addition. It is acknowledged that the existing building features limited architectural merit and is not within a conservation area, the detailed design of the proposed first floor extension is not an appropriate style for the building. The proposed pitched roof is considered acceptable in principle; however, it encloses the middle section of the flat roof and proposed rooflights, which is considered an awkward arrangement that appears disjointed and incongruous with the host building.

3.11 It is acknowledged that the two storey building at No. 36 Shoot-Up Hill is located within the vicinity of the site. However this building is of a considerable age, and given it is detached of the main building at the front of the site, and thus clearly reads as a separate entity to this building; it is not considered to provide a suitable precedent for the proposed development.

#### **4. Amenity**

4.1 It is considered negligible harm would be caused in regard to the amenity of the neighbouring properties or surrounding gardens in terms of access to sunlight, daylight, privacy, outlook, noise or sense of enclosure by the proposed rear extension.

4.2 The additions at first floor level would be viewed from the rear habitable windows of No. 40 and the side habitable windows of No. 42 Shoot-Up Hill. Therefore concerns are raised on the visual bulk and outlook amenity.

4.3 By virtue of its position upon the roof of No. 40A, it is not considered there would not be adverse impacts upon the daylight or sunlight towards adjoining residential occupiers.

4.4 The proposed window to the front elevation would cause issues of overlooking and privacy towards the occupiers of the rear habitable windows of No. 40 in which there is not sufficient distance between the windows to overcome this issue. This alone is a reason for refusal.

4.5 The proposed windows to the rear elevation are located a sufficient distance to not raise amenity concerns. The proposal includes the addition of a terrace to the rear of the mansard element. The proposed terrace is set in from the sides of the boundaries in order to restrict views into the adjoining properties, and as such is not considered to raise issues of overlooking to the adjoining properties.

## **5. Recommendation**

Refuse Planning Permission.

