

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	26/04/2017
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	05/04/2017
<b>Officer</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Hugh Miller		2017/1013/P		
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
Flat 2 191 Fordwych Road London NW2 3NH		See draft decision		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>				
Erection of a 2- storey rear extension and alterations to self-contained flat.				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Householder Application			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	Site Notice displayed 15/03/2017, expires 05/04/2017.  <u>Objection: Flat 3, 191 Fordwych Road,</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Plans submitted show a reasonably attractive extension for Flat 2 but with a roof-line very out of keeping with the rest of the property. Were the roof of the master bedroom to be pitched, in line with the remainder of the first floor of Flat 2, very little headroom would be lost in a small part of the bedroom but the design would be vastly improved and surprisingly more light would reach the back windows of the ground and first floor (Flats 1 and 3) in the main house.</li> <li>• The proposed extension will obscure natural light also views.</li> <li>• Concern about access for the sites' development.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify	Not in CA.					

## Site Description

A semi-detached, 2-storey dwelling located on the north side of Fredwych Road and south of the railway line. The building is divided into 2 self-contained flats which is characteristic of the residential buildings.

The application relates to Flat 2, which occupies part ground and part 1<sup>st</sup> floor levels at the rear of the building and is accessed via a side entrance.

The building is not within a designated conservation area.

## Relevant History

PP Granted – July 2001- Conversion of existing loftspace into a bedroom for the existing top flat, including formation of dormer to rear; ref. PWX0103295.

PP Refused – March 2001 - Conversion of property from 2 self-contained flats into 3 self-contained flats, the erection of rear dormer and single storey rear extension plus associated elevational alterations; ref. PWX0003071

Appeal Allowed - September 2001- Conversion to 3x self-contained flats plus roof extension and single-storey rear extension as carfree development; ref. Appeal Ref. APP/X5210/A/01/10645

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

### Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

### Supplementary Planning Guidance (Camden Planning Guidance)

CPG1 Design (2015) Chapters 2 and 4

CPG6 Amenity (2011) Chapters 6 and 7

### London Plan 2016

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012.

### Camden Local Plan Draft Submission 2016

*D1 Design*

*A1 Managing the impact of development*

*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 ended 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

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 Erection of a 2- storey rear extension and alterations to self-contained flat.

1.2 The main issues for consideration are:

- The design, impact of the proposal upon the character and appearance of the host building and local area;
- Amenity

### 2.0 Design

2.1 The host building has a 2-storey rear closet wing with mono-pitched roof which is typical of the semi-detached terrace group of houses nos.173 -195. In September 2001, a single-storey extension was added to the closet wing and project 3.0m beyond the original rear building line from 8.0m to 11m depth. The proposal would replace this rear extension with an increased footplate. The proposed extension would have a 'L' shaped footplate at the ground floor level projecting approximately 1.36m on the north side and 4.76m on the east side (rear closet wing building line); whilst the 1st floor element of the extension would setback on both the east and south-east sides. The footplate of the extension measure 12.9sqm and the new extension would occupy approximately 31percent of the rear garden amenity space.

2.2 Policy DP24, states all developments, including extensions (paragraph 24.7 should consider:

- the character and constraints of its site;
- the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;
- the compatibility of materials, their quality, texture, tone and colour;
- the composition of elevations;
- the suitability of the proposed design to its intended use;
- its contribution to public realm, and its impact on views and vistas; and
- the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value.

2.3 Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) 1 states that alterations should always take into account the character and design of the property and its surroundings and rear extensions should be secondary to the building being extended. In terms of proposing roof alterations and extensions the main considerations should be scale and visual prominence, the effect on the established townscape and architectural style and the effect on neighbouring properties.

2.4 The proposed two-storey rear extension is considered to create an 'L-shaped' wing to the rear of the house. It would be gain site coverage of the modest rear garden and would be a large addition which would not be considered secondary to the main building. The rear extension would not respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building and create an unwelcome bulky rear extension which would be harmful to the overall character and pattern of development of sensitively designed semi-detached dwellings within this terrace group. Whilst the rear extension to the host building is largely obscured from view due to its central position within the terrace, its height and overall massing, detailed design, scale and proportions and use of materials would not be subordinate to the host building or the terraced group of which it forms part. The rear extension would not accord with CPG extension guidance, which requires extension to be 1- full storey below the roof eaves. Its size and unsympathetic design and form more readily reflect a wholly contemporary design host building rather than a Victorian one.

2.5 The detailed design of the rear extension comprises prefabrication, vertical Cedar cladding timber, Grey polyester powder coated aluminium framed windows and Flat roof, Grey polyester powder coated aluminium flashing. The applicant state, para.3.2 (DAS) '*The design aims to evoke a high quality finish to the existing property, improving the aesthetic of the existing site appearance*'. The asymmetrical form and use of materials together with the contemporary design of the extension are considered inconsistent with the existing built form and would interrupt a still largely uniform rear

building line within the terrace group. The CPG states (para.4.10) that *rear extensions should be designed to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing; respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style; and respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area.* The proposed extension is considered to fail these tests. In this setting, the proposal is not considered a ‘...benchmark example of contemporary architecture and design and construction in the area...’. The proposal is considered to be clearly at odds with and in contrast to the existing closet wing form of largely shallow depth single-storey rear extensions as already exists on the host building and also at neighbouring buildings at nos. 193 and 195 Fordwych Road. The proposed 2-storey extension is considered unsympathetic and is unacceptable especially to the mid-terrace building that is visually prominent from the private views from the adjacent dwellinghouses although partially obscured from the public realm.

2.6 The Council welcomes contemporary designed proposals; but within the appropriate context where it would create harmony and integrates into its surrounding. The issue here is that the existing 2-storey rear closet wings are largely homogeneous in their detailed design, scale and proportions and use of materials. The rear of the semi-detached group nos.173 -195 are largely uninterrupted with extensions and where they exist they are generally of single-storey. As such, and by virtue of its detailed design, size and siting and use of materials, the 2-storey extension therefore creates an unacceptably obtrusive and incongruous form of development, disrupting the largely unaltered rear closet wings and detracts from the appearance of the rear of the properties. Furthermore, the resulting precedent and the cumulative impact of this contemporary rear extension within this semi-detached terrace and the wider street would be detrimental to the appearance of the host building and the character and appearance of the local area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the design guidance of CPG 1 (Design) and Policy DP24 of the LDF.

### **3.0 Amenity**

3.1 The proposed 2-storey rear extension which include a chamfered south-east elevation at the 1st floor level would not cause harm to occupiers at no.189 in terms of loss of day/sunlight, outlook or cause a sense of enclosure and is considered acceptable. The flat roof is not proposed as amenity space and is considered satisfactory. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not have any significant impact on existing residential amenity. The proposal is considered satisfactory and is in accordance with DP26 and CPG6.

**4.0 Recommendation:** Refuse planning permission.