

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		03/07/2017	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		05/07/2017	
Officer				Application Numbers			
Anna Roe				2017/2619/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
35 Crediton Hill, London, NW6 1HS				Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal							
Erection of single storey, full width rear extension with 4x rooflights, following demolition of existing part-width extension; insertion of 2x rooflights to rear main roof slope; insertion of door and Juliet balcony within first floor bay window							
Recommendation:		Refuse Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	N/A	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		<u>Planning</u> Advertisement in local press: 01/06/2017 – 22/06/2017 Site notice displayed: 31/05/2017 – 21/06/2017					
CAAC comments:		N/A					

Site Description

No. 35 Crediton Hill is located on the western side of the road and comprises a detached, single family dwellinghouse.

Crediton Hill is defined by large semi-detached and detached houses, with tree lined streets and gardens. The houses are built in the arts and crafts style with brown tiled roofs, warm red brick walls and white painted timber sash windows subdivided by glazing bars.

The property falls within the West End Green Conservation Area and is identified as a positive contributor in the Appraisal and Management Strategy.

Relevant History

35 Crediton Hill

2017/0296/P - Installation of side entrance door at ground floor. Installation of rooflight to front roof slope. Alterations to front entrance stairs. Replacement double glazed windows throughout. Partial render of front and rear facades and full render of side elevations. *Granted 22/03/17.*

2017/1665/P - Erection of single storey rear extension (4m deep, 3.4m high and 3.2m wide). Erection of Juliette balcony at first floor rear elevation. *Certificate of lawfulness withdrawn 08/05/17.*

33 Crediton Hill

2013/0033/P - Erection of a single storey rear extension to existing dwelling house (Class C3). *Lawful Development Certificate Granted 29/01/2013.*

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

London Plan, 2016

Camden Local Plan, 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development
C6 Access for all
D1 Design
D2 Heritage

Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design, 2015, chapter 1,2 and 4
CPG6 Amenity, 2011

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015)

West End Green conservation area appraisal and management strategy (2011)

1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the following works:

- Erection of a single storey rear extension, with 4x conservation style rooflights. The proposed extension would measure 8.5m wide x 5.3m deep x 3.3m high (with a flat roof). It would be faced in white render, with full width, aluminium framed, double glazed rear doors
- Installation of 2x conservation rooflights into the rear roof slope
- Door and Juliet balcony to replace the first floor bay window

2. Assessment

The main issues in this case are:

- The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area
- Whether the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers

3. Design and Conservation

3.1 Policy D1 (Design) of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will require a high quality of design for all buildings and spaces in the borough. Policy D2 (heritage) relates to conserving the Borough's heritage and requires development within conservation areas to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.

3.2 Chapter 4 of CPG1 (Design) provides guidance on extensions and alterations. It notes that extensions should be secondary to the building being extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing. They should protect and preserve the existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies and chimney stacks.

3.3 The West End Green Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy states that in all cases *'the Council will expect original architectural features to be retained, protected [or] refurbished in an appropriate manner'*.

3.4 Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan notes that *'all development shall be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead'*.

3.5 The proposal would result in a substantial built element projecting from the rear of the host property. The width, combined with the depth of the rear extension, would dominate the rear elevation and the proposed extension represents an incongruous and excessively bulky addition that would fail to appear subordinate to the host building. Although the existing rear projection is also relatively deep, the fact it is narrow reduces its overall impact. The proposed extension would be both deep and wide, which contributes to its dominance and lack of subservience.

3.6 Furthermore, due to the fact that the proposed extension is full width, it would result in the loss of the lower half of the original double height bay window, which is an original feature of the host building which contributes to its attractiveness. Double height bays are a characteristic feature of the historic group properties on the west side of Crediton Hill. The proposed rear extension would cause undue and irreversible harm to this original architectural feature,

affecting the architectural integrity of both the host building and the wider area.

- 3.7 The introduction of a glazed door and Juliet balcony at first floor level would also cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building as the works would be out of keeping with the style of the host building, as double doors and Juliet balconies are not a typical feature of bay windows, particularly at first floor level, above a large ground floor extension such as in this case.
- 3.8 The 4x rooflights above the single storey rear extension are also considered to be incongruous and out of keeping with the character and appearance of the host building. Although they may not be visible in many views of the host building, they take up a large proportion of the roof and would give the roof a cluttered appearance when viewed from above.
- 3.9 The neighbouring residential dwelling to the south (no. 33) has a comparable rear extension providing some context for the proposed development. However, the neighbouring extension was built under permitted development (i.e. not requiring planning permission) and therefore is not considered to represent a suitable precedent. The neighbouring rear extension is considered to be poorly designed and bulky, and is not considered to be a high quality example of development to replicate.
- 3.10 Although the proposal would affect only the rear of the property and would be largely unseen in public views, the significance of the conservation area derives from the buildings and layout as a whole, regardless of whether particular elements are open to public view. Its significance does not therefore rely only on the elements that can readily be seen.
- 3.11 The 2x roof lights proposed in the rear roof slope are considered to be acceptable.
- 3.12 To conclude, the West End Green Conservation Area is a designated heritage asset to which the proposal would cause harm, counter to the aims of the Camden Local Plan. The application is therefore recommended for refusal on this basis.

4. Residential Amenity

- 4.1 Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the Local Plan seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. CPG6 (Amenity) provides more detailed advice. Paragraphs 7.8 and 7.9 state that the proximity, size or cumulative effect of any structures should not have an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers.
- 4.2 The proposed extension is not considered to have a harmful impact on neighbouring amenity. It would not have a negative effect on the neighbouring occupiers to the north (no. 37) because it would not appear materially different to the existing rear extension at the host property. Equally, it would not detract from the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers to the south (no. 33) as this property has an existing 3m rear extension.
- 4.3 With regard to the proposed new door and Juliet balcony, the views would not be markedly different from those possible from the existing projecting bay window at first floor level. As such, the development is not considered to cause harm to neighbouring amenity in terms of overlooking.
- 4.4 Overall, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in this respect.

5. Recommendation

Refuse planning permission