

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	14/11/2017
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:	13/10/2017
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Tessa Craig			2017/4358/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
26 Richborough Road London NW2 3LX			See decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of single storey side and rear extension.					
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Householder Application			
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:					
Consultations					
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00	
	No. electronic	00			
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notices were displayed 22/09/2017-13/10/2017.				
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	n/a				

Site Description

The subject site is located on the south side of Richborough Road and comprises a two storey brick, semi-detached property with a part width closet wing and a modest rear garden. The property is not within a conservation area and nor is the building listed. The property is within the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Area and Forum.

The surrounding area is residential in nature and on this side of Richborough Road the majority of properties retain their original plan form without any extension to the rear. The property benefits from permitted development rights.

Relevant History

None.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 Design

Supplementary Planning Policies

CPG1: Design

2 - Design excellence;

CPG6: Amenity

6 - Daylight and sunlight;

7 - Overlooking, privacy and outlook

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015 (FG&WNP)

Policy 2 Design & Character

Assessment

1. Proposal

- 1.1. Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey side infill and rear extension. The side infill extension would be 6.43m deep and 1.9m wide with a pitched glazed roof. The roof of the side infill extension would be 2.3m at the boundary with 25 Richborough Road and 3.6m where it meets the main house. The rear extension is to be an additional 2m off the side infill extension and rear elevation of the closet wing and 5.1m wide with a gap between the rear extension and 27 Richborough Road. The extension would be 22.7sqm in total (including side infill and rear extension).
- 1.2. The extension would be built from brickwork to match the main property and the rear elevation would include four aluminium framed glazed doors.

2. Assessment

- 2.1. The main considerations in relation to the proposed extensions are the design and the impact on neighbouring amenity.

Design

- 2.2. Policy D1 design of the Camden Local Plan advises the Council will seek to secure high quality design in development. The Council will require that development respects local context and character.
- 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.
- 2.4. 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.
- 2.5. Policy 2 of the FG&WNP (Design & Character) states that all development shall be a high quality design which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead. It states that extensions and infill development shall be in character and and proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties. The neighbourhood plan further states in order to protect the Area's green/open spaces, the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided.
- 2.6. It is clear from visiting the site, reviewing aerial maps and the Council planning records that there is no precedent for side and rear infill extensions of this size/bulk. The existing rear garden is 88sqm, the extension (22.7sqm) would cover 22.8% of the garden space. Whilst a modest infill extension may be appropriate, the infill extension coupled with the rear extension would significantly reduce the rear garden space and add significant bulk as to overwhelm the original proportions and plan form of the original semi-detached house to the detriment of the building. The extensions would not constitute a subordinate or respectful addition and would be overly bulky and unacceptable in design terms.
- 2.7. The detailed design of the extension is considered to be clumsy and unattractive particularly where the roof of the extensions meets the main property. The height of the ridge of the extensions interferes with the first floor meeting the main building just below the window eaves both in the side and rear. The detailing does not allow the extensions to form a coherent addition and would appear ad-hoc and harmful to the character of the rear elevation.

2.8. The proposed materials (brick to match existing and aluminium framed doors) are considered to be acceptable.

Amenity

2.9. The proposed single-storey side infill and rear extension which includes a pitched roof at the side would not cause harm to occupiers at no.25 in terms of loss of day/sunlight, outlook or cause a sense of enclosure and is considered acceptable. As such, it is considered that the proposal would not have any significant impact on existing residential amenity. The proposal is considered satisfactory in terms of amenity impact and is in accordance with policy A1 and CPG6.

3. Recommendation

3.1. Refuse planning permission on design grounds.