

Planning objection on behalf of residents at 15 West Heath Road, NW3 7UU, in respect of planning application ref:2017/5365/P.

The main objections relate to the following:

- 1) Harmful impact the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the building overall and harmful impact the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area.
- 2) The harmful increase in the sense of enclosure and loss of outlook from the neighbouring properties at flats A, C & E.
- 3) The resultant level of overlooking and consequential loss of privacy to neighbouring residential occupiers.
- 4) The increase in the size of the terraced area at first floor level, would allow for an increase in activity on the terraced area, with consequential noise and disturbance to neighbouring residential occupiers, in particular to the occupiers of flat H, at second floor level.

(1) Harmful impact the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the building overall and harmful impact the proposal would have on the character and appearance of the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area.

While the proposed extension will have a similar footprint to the extension granted planning permission (ref: 2014/4765/P – permission expires 23rd November 2017), this proposal would result in the loss of the existing pitched roof and significantly increase the bulk and mass overall when compared to the approved scheme. This proposal would also allow for an increase in the size of the existing terrace area for the first floor flat.

The existing pitched roof is an important feature which replicates similar design forms throughout the building. The resultant changes would alter the overall roof profile and integrity of the building. The resultant visual effect would detract from the architectural style and coherence of the rear elevations of this property and the overall rhythm and consistency of roofs throughout the building.

The proposed height of the extension together with the brick balustrade surrounding the proposed extension and the existing back addition would add considerable bulk and mass which would not be sympathetic to the character and appearance of the building or the area generally, resulting in visual harm overall.

The proposal would also result in significant visual intrusion to the residents of the flats within the property. The neighbouring flats at ground floor level would view a significantly bulkier extension than the one previously approved.

The occupiers of upper floor flats would also view an extension which is not sympathetic to the design form of the building overall. The loss of the pitched roof, which is an important characteristic of the building, when viewed together with the

other existing pitched roofs throughout the building would compromise the integrity of the building overall adding further to visual intrusion.

Furthermore, section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area. This property is located within the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area. And as such, any proposal needs to either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. It cannot be said that the proposed loss of the pitched roof, which is an important feature of the building overall, and the increase in bulk in mass overall would either preserve or enhance the character and appearance of this part of the Redington/Frognaal Conservation Area. Planning policies requires proposals to be of a high-quality design which contribute positively in complementing local character, whilst preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This proposal fails to do so therefore, should be refused on those grounds alone.

(2) The harmful increase in the sense of enclosure and loss of outlook from the neighbouring properties at flats A, C & E.

The introduction of a brick balustrade to surround the proposed extension and existing back addition would add considerable bulk which would result in a significant loss of outlook and increase the sense of enclosure to the neighbouring ground floor flats.

Flat C has recently built a rear extension which provides significant outlook across the rear towards flat B. The outlook from this extension now needs to be protected – this was not a consideration when the previous proposal (permission expires 23/11/17) was being considered (because it did not exist at the time the last proposal was being considered).

Flat C is at a lower level than flat B therefore, any increase in bulk would have a larger impact than would be the case if the neighbouring properties were on the same level. It is considered that the proposed depth and height of the proposal would together result in significant impact on the outlook from the windows of the neighbouring habitable room of flat C.

Harmful loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure would also occur to the neighbouring flat A.

The proposal includes the extension of the existing terraced area for flat E at first floor level. I am advised that the occupiers of this flat object to the proposal because while it would increase the size of their terraced area, it would lead to a high balustrade that would block their outlook when sitting on their chairs.

(3) The resultant level of overlooking and consequential loss of privacy to neighbouring residential occupiers.

The planning officers report for the previous proposal stated that the proposal included side doors and windows which would be obscured glazed. The report went on to say

that “a condition has been added in order to protect neighbouring properties. This glazing would help to reduce overlooking opportunities to neighbouring properties, especially as there are habitable rooms nearby.”

It was therefore recognised by planning officers last time that side windows and doors of the proposal had the potential to allow for overlooking and loss of privacy. This proposal seeks the addition of terraced areas on the side at ground floor level and large sliding doors on the side elevations. This would allow for significant overlooking and consequential loss of privacy to neighbouring occupiers of flats A & C. If the council are consistent in their decision making, then the proposed sliding doors and terraced areas should be considered unacceptable. Any potential solution to introduce obscured glazing screens on the boundaries would only add considerable bulk and lead to a significant loss of outlook and increased sense of enclosure.

Even if the sliding doors on the side elevation were obscured glazed, their design allows them to fully open. And if the sliding doors were replaced by large windows, the large expanse of windows would lead to a harmful level of perceived overlooking. While obscuring large windows stops overlooking it has been held that perceived overlooking is a material consideration, with the actual harm increasing with increased size of glazing close to sensitive locations.

(4) The increase in the size of the terraced area at first floor level, would allow for an increase in activity on the terraced area, with consequential noise and disturbance to neighbouring residential occupiers, in particular to the occupiers of flat H, at second floor level.

The increase in the size of the terraced area at first floor level would allow more people to use the amenity area (including parties) thus increasing the level of activity and associated noise, detrimental to neighbouring residential occupiers, in particular to the occupiers of flat H, at second floor level.

Joe Henry

Planning Consultant