

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	19/10/2017
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	05/10/2017
Officer		Application Number(s)		
Nastassja Lazarus		2017/4390/P		
Application Address		Drawing Numbers		
2nd Floor Flat 36 Mill Lane London NW6 1NR		Refer to decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of roof extensions to the main roof and to back addition of existing 2nd floor residential flat.				
Recommendation(s):	Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

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
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed between 17/08/2017 and 07/09/2017</p> <p>No responses have been received from individuals.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments:	<p>Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Area and Forum. The Forum initially provided representations to Council, advising that documents relating to the application had not been made public. Documents were subsequently made public by Planning Officers.</p> <p>Further comments were received from the forum stating that the Forum had no comment on this particular application, however the Forum note the absence of dimensions on drawings despite the presence of a scale bar.</p> <p>The Forum highlighted general concerns about increasing heights relative to nearby buildings, as per the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p><i>Officer comment: Forum comments are acknowledged. Regarding dimensions on drawings. There is no requirement to provide dimensions. As per local validation requirements plans must be drawn at a minimum scale of 1:50, or 1:100. The provided plans have been drawn at a scale of 1:50, therefore meeting the local validation requirements.</i></p> <p><i>Concerns regarding building heights are acknowledged.</i></p>					

Site Description

The application site is a three storey plus semi-basement and four storey rear addition. 36 Mill Lane is a mid-terrace property, located on the southern side of Mill Lane. The existing use of the site is retail and residential at ground floor level and residential on upper floors.

The site is not listed, nor is it within a conservation area.

Relevant History

[2017/2062/P](#) - Erection of mansard roof extension to existing 2nd floor residential flat. Granted 28-04-2017.

[2004/2450/P](#) - Change of use of the existing ground floor shop from Class A1 (general retail) use to Class A2 (financial & professional services). Granted 22-06-2004

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

The London Plan, 2016

Camden Local Plan, 2017

Policy D1 – Design

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Camden Planning Guidance

DPG1 - Design (2015) – chapter 4 – section 4.9 Rear Extensions

CPG6 – Amenity (2011) – chapter 6

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015)

POLICY 2: Design & Character

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for:

- Erection of roof extension to the main roof; and
- Erection of a rear extension on top of the existing back addition.

2. Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in the assessment of the application for planning permission are:

- The visual impact of the proposed development on the host dwelling and surrounding development.
- Whether the proposed development would be harmful to the living conditions of the neighbouring occupiers.

3. The visual impact of the proposed development on the host dwelling and surrounding development.

3.1 Camden's Local Plan seeks to protect and enhance the environment and heritage. Policy D1 require all developments, to be of the highest standard of design and the Council will expect developments to consider the character and proportions of the existing building, where extensions are proposed and the quality of materials will be a key consideration.

3.2 Chapter 4 of Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design) offers detailed advice on the design of rear extensions. The guidance recommends extensions should be secondary to the building being extended in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing.

3.3 The current planning application is a re-submission of the original scheme submitted as per application reference: 2017/2062/P. The 2017/2062/P proposal was revised to exclude the extension on top of the existing back addition, and was subsequently considered to be acceptable by Officer's, thus permission was granted for a mansard style extension to the main roof of the building.

3.4 Main roof extension

3.5 The mansard was approved under recent approval for an additional floor at this property (Planning permission reference: 2017/2062/P), granted 28-04-2017. Therefore the proposal for a mansard style extension to the main roof is considered to be acceptable.

3.6 Rear extension on top of the existing back addition

3.7 The proposal for a rear extension on top of the existing back addition is considered to be unacceptable as the proposal is not a common form of development in the terrace, the extension would rise above the eaves of the main building resulting in an incongruous and dominant addition to the host building and the terrace generally.

3.8 Upon undertaking a site inspection and a desk top search, it was found that there were no additions which rise above the eaves level in the terrace. It is acknowledged that a comparatively small stair access housing is present at end-terrace property, No. 32 Mill Lane, although this is historic (approved in 1989 - planning permission reference: 8804398) and

Council's policies have changed since this time to discourage visually harmful development. It is therefore considered that the presence of the historic extension at No. 32 Mill Lane bears no significant weight to the proposal at subject site, No. 36 Mill Lane.

3.9 The proposal would be contradictory to CPG - 1 Design, which strongly discourages extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level (section 4.13), as the proposal would rise above the eaves line of the main building and would further impair the eaves line of the rear elevation resulting in an incongruous addition to the host building.

4. In summary the proposal would result in a dominant built form that would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and neighbouring properties within the terrace

4.1 Therefore the proposed rear extension on top of the existing back addition is not considered to be acceptable as the proposal would result in an overly dominant and incongruous addition, and would not be in keeping with the host dwelling and surrounding development. Therefore the proposal would be contradictory to policies D1 – Design of The Camden Local Plan 2017, and policy 2: Design & Character of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

5. Amenity

5.1 Given that the proposal would be located within the footprint of the existing building, and the acceptable distance of the proposal to windows of neighbouring properties, there would be no significant increase in loss daylight, sunlight, privacy or overlooking to adjoining properties. Further, proposed openings at No. 36 Mill Lane would be at the same plane as existing openings in the building.

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission.