

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	30/01/2017
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	05/01/2017
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Evelyn Jones			2016/6661/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
Garden Flat 30 Frognal London NW3 6AG			8000-002 A, 8000-001 A, 8000-E-02, 8000-E-1 A, 8000-E-03, 8000-101 A, 8000-E-04, 8000-P-01		
<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 to lower ground floor flat					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed from 13/12/2016 and a public notice was published in the Ham & High from 15/12/2016.  The owner/occupier of 28 Frognal objected to the proposal on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A three metre high brick wall built against the boundary would be unsightly</li><li>• Loss of amenity</li><li>• As is the case with many other properties in the area, this extension should be smaller and should incorporate the existing bay window feature</li></ul>					
CAAC/Local residents groups:	Redington Frognal Association <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Object to the felling of the cherry</li><li>• Light pollution from the excessive glazing and roof lights</li><li>• The extension should be reduced significantly to allow for the retention of the cherry tree and to reduce the impacts on neighbouring properties.</li></ul>					

### Site Description

The site is a lower ground floor flat in a four storey semi-detached property on the east side of Frognal. The site lies within the Redington Frognal Conservation Area and has been identified as making a positive contribution to the area but is not listed.

### Relevant History

**2016/4586/P** – Installation of 3 rooflights in roof valley, 1 to the rear roof slope, and the replacement of the existing front rooflight with a conservation rooflight. **Granted 10/10/2016**

#### 28 Frognal

**2015/0214/P** – Erection of rear, lower ground, part-width, single storey extension and replacement windows to existing bay. **Granted 30/01/2015**

### Relevant policies

#### National and Regional Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)  
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  
DP25 - Conserving Camden's heritage

## DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### **Camden Local Plan Submission Draft 2016 Policies**

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

### **Camden Planning Guidance**

**CPG1 Design (2015)**

**CPG6 Amenity (2011)**

**Redington and Frognal Conservation Area Statement (2003)**

The emerging Local Plan is reaching the final stages of its public examination. Consultation on proposed modifications to the Submission Draft Local Plan began on 30 January and ends on 13 March 2017. The modifications have been proposed in response to Inspector's comments during the examination and seek to ensure that the Inspector can find the plan 'sound' subject to the modifications being made to the Plan. The Local Plan at this stage is a material consideration in decision making, but pending publication of the Inspector's report into the examination only has limited weight.

## **Assessment**

### **1. Proposal:**

1.1 The application proposes:

- The erection of a single storey rear extension to the lower ground floor flat.

1.2 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design
- Amenity

### **2. Design**

2.1 With regard to LDF policy approach, respecting the local character is an intrinsic aim. In particular DP24 & DP25, require careful consideration of the characteristics of a 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.

2.2 The Redington and Frognal Conservation Area Statement states that rear extensions can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials and can affect the architectural integrity of the host property and character of the conservation area (RF23). The Statement also states that 'rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would spoil a uniform rear elevation of an unspoilt terrace or group of buildings (RF25).

2.3 Policy CS14 aims to ensure the highest design standards from developments. Policy DP24 also states that the Council will require all development, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and to respect the character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties as well as the character and proportions of the existing building. Furthermore, Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas.

2.4 CPG 1 (design), states that rear extensions should 'respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style' and 'respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks' (para 4.10).

2.5 The application site is a lower ground floor flat within a four storey semi-detached property on the east side of Frognal, within the Redington Frognal Conservation Area. The property forms part of a large group of substantial red brick turn-of-the-century semi-detached properties located on the east side of the street. The property is identified as a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.6 The proposed rear extension fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Redington and Frognal Conservation Area due to the fact that its full width would result in the loss of the lower half of the original double height bay window, therefore not respecting the character or original architectural features of the host building.

2.7 Double height bay windows are a characteristic feature of the rear of this grouping of historic properties on the east side of Frognal. The proposed rear extension causes harm to this original architectural feature, and to the unspoilt nature of its consistent presence within the wider grouping, affecting the architectural integrity of both the host building and wider group and therefore negatively affecting the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.8 An acceptable alternative would be to reduce the width of the proposed extension to enable the retention of the bay feature. This has been approved and implemented at no.28 Frognal, preserving the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.9 Within this context, the rear extension, by virtue of its size and location fails to respect the character and proportions of the host building. The full width extension would be unsympathetic to the host building making no concession to its original features and would result in the loss of existing architectural features of the property.

2.10 The loss of the lower ground floor bay is considered unacceptable in this context as it would be an inconsistency in the rear elevation of the terrace. Other applications in the street, including at the adjoining property 28 Frognal, (ref 2015/0214/P) have been resisted and amended to incorporate the bay feature into the design of the extension. The double height bay is a consistent feature throughout the terrace from numbers 22 to 34 Frognal and while properties such as no. 28 and no.34 have made alterations to the rear, these have all been half width extensions which allowed for the retention of the lower ground floor bay and to retain the form of the rear elevation of these historic properties on the east side of Frognal.

2.11 Furthermore, whilst the addition of a full width rear extension resulting in the loss of the lower ground floor bay is considered unacceptable in principle, the detailed design and form of the proposed extension is also considered inappropriate. The glazed design of the extension would not be a sympathetic addition to the property and by virtue of its insensitive design would be an incongruous addition to the host property.

2.12 The proposal would also include the excavation of 4.6 metres of the existing rear garden leaving an 11.1 metre deep rear garden and retaining a 2 metre deep terraced area to the rear of the property. This is considered an acceptable amount of outdoor amenity space remaining at the property.

### **3. Neighbour amenity**

3.1 Given the size and location of the proposed extension, it is considered that levels of privacy, levels of light and outlook of neighbouring properties would not be detrimentally impacted as a result of the development.

**Recommendation:** Refuse Planning Permission