Delegated Report	Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	01/12/2017
	N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	06/10/2017

Officer	Application Number(s)
Lisa McCann	2017/4933/P
Application Address	**Drawing Numbers**
Flat 1 57 Hemstal Road London NW6 2AD	Location Plan, 17:2106:01, 17:2106:02.

PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature

Proposal(s)

Proposed erection of part two storey and part single storey ground floor and lower ground floor rear extension including rear roof terrace

Recommendation(s):	**Refused**
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 No. electronic	**00** **00**	No. of objections	**00**
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice displayed 15/09/2017 (expired 06/10/2017). The application was not advertised in the local press because it is not located in a conservation area. No responses received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	No responses received.					

Site Description

The site is a four storey mid-terraced house on the south side of Hemstal Road which comprises 3 flats and a commercial ground floor unit. The application relates to flat 1 located over the lower ground floor ground floor.

The application site is not located in a Conservation Area nor is it listed; however, it is located within the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan area.

Relevant History

4583/AD693(R) - Erection of a double sided illuminated projecting box sign measuring 3 ft x 2 ft 6 ins (0.9m x 0.75m), to be fixed at fascia level. – Granted 18.01.1978.

PW9902562 - Change of use and works of conversion to provide 2 self contained maisonettes (plus retention of shop at ground floor) and installation of 3 rooflights, As shown on drawing numbers; PD/101 and PD102a. – Granted 21.09.1999.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017
Policy A1 Managing the impact of development
Policy D1 Design
Policy D2 Heritage

Supplementary Planning Policies
CPG1: Design
CPG6: Amenity

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood 2015
Policy 2 (Design & Character)

Assessment

1 Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for a part two storey and part single storey rear extension. A rear terrace area is also proposed on the roof of the proposed part single storey rear extension which would be accessed from a bedroom.

2 Assessment

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

- Design (the impact of the proposal on character and appearance of the host building and wider area); and
- Amenity (the impact of the proposal on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers).

3 Design

3.1 A site visit confirmed that a part two storey part single storey rear outrigger extension is currently in situ at the subject property. Planning permission is sought to extend the existing ground and lower ground floor extensions, so that the lower ground floor rear extension would project an additional of 5.8m rearwards and the two storey element would project an additional 3.6m rearwards from the existing two storey outrigger. The proposed rear extensions would measure a total depth of 9.6m deep at lower ground floor level and 7.4m at ground floor level. This part two storey, part single storey rear extension and terrace area would be built along the shared boundary with the adjoining property no. 55. A single story infill extension is also proposed along the shared boundary with the other adjoining property no. 59, projecting a depth of 8.2m rearwards measuring a max height of 2.7m and 2.4m at the eaves.

3.2 The following considerations contained within policy D1 'Design' of the Camden Local Plan 2017 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used.

3.3 Paragraph 3.7 of CPG1 states: "Rear extensions should be designed to: be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing". It is considered that the existing part two storey, part single storey rear outrigger currently in situ is a significant size and any additional extension would result in a cumulatively dominant and bulky addition which would not respect the scale and character of the original property. The combined depth of the existing outrigger and proposed extension would measure a max depth of 9.6m at lower ground floor level and 7.4m at ground floor level. The scale of the proposed development is considered significantly greater than the existing and would not be a subordinate addition to the host building, harming its original proportions and character

3.4 It was noted on site visit that a rear extension is currently in situ at the neighbouring property no 59. This extension is considered to be an excessive depth and there are no records to indicate that planning permission was granted for a development of this scale. The neighbouring extension does not therefore inform the acceptability of surrounding development and the current proposals cannot be justified in this instance.

3.5 Paragraph 4.7 of CPG1 states: "uPVC windows are not acceptable both aesthetically and for environmental reasons, including their relatively short lifespan and inability to biodegrade." The plans submitted indicate that uPVC material is proposed including for the windows and also the single storey conservatory infill element. This is contrary to CPG1 guidance and is not

acceptable.

2.6 Overall, for the reasons outlined above, the proposed development would not be subordinate to the host building nor would it respect or preserve the original proportions of the building. The cumulative impact of the proposed development is considered to appear as a dominant addition which would not respect the character of the original property or surrounding area and cannot be supported.

2.7 As such, the proposal is considered to harm the appearance of the host building and surrounding area and would be contrary to policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and Camden Planning Guidance.

3 Amenity

3.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. It seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight. CPG6 (Amenity) provides specific guidance with regards to privacy, overlooking and outlook.

3.2 There are concerns regarding the overbearing visual impact of the proposed extension when viewed from the rear garden of neighbouring property no.55. At present only the existing single storey rear extension projects approx. 2.6m beyond the existing rear outrigger at no. 55. The proposed extension would project 5.9m beyond this neighbouring outrigger at lower ground floor level and approx. 3.7m rearwards for the first floor element. The cumulative bulk and scale of this extension would appear visually obtrusive and overbearing when viewed from the rear amenity space of no. 55. Furthermore the proposed terrace area on the roof of the proposed single storey element would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking to this neighbouring rear amenity space which could not be supported. It is noted that privacy screens are proposed along the boundary with no. 59 to address amenity concerns; however, this is not considered to be sufficient as overlooking of no.55 would still be possible. The proposed development is therefore considered to result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of no. 55 for the reasons outlined above and cannot be supported.

3.3 A site visit confirmed that no.59 features rear-facing windows on the rear elevation and on the east facing outrigger flank wall. Planning reference PWX0103861 indicates that these lower ground floor windows serve a living room, kitchen and bedroom. These are habitable rooms that the Council would seek to protect in accordance with CPG 6 (para 6.6). BRE tests were carried out on the lower ground floor habitable room windows (except the bathroom and landing windows) described above.

3.4 The extension is likely to have an impact on the daylight received by the lower ground floor habitable room windows at the neighbouring property no. 59, particularly the neighbouring living room and kitchen windows as indicated in planning reference PWX0103861 as it would fail the 25 degree test as referred to in CPG 6 (para 6.7). In the absence of a BRE daylight/sunlight assessment, the applicant has failed to demonstrate the impact would be acceptable. Furthermore, as the flank wall windows affected are east facing windows it is likely that sunlight levels would be substantially affected and so the reason for refusal is on both sunlight and daylight grounds. Overall, in the absence of a daylight/sunlight assessment to indicate otherwise, it is considered that the proposal would result in a significant loss of daylight and sunlight to the lower ground floor habitable room windows of no 59.

3.5 The outlook of the lower ground floor windows at no 59 are already affected by the existing rear outrigger extensions at the subject property. However the excessive scale and depth of the proposed development is considered to significantly worsen the outlook for these windows. The proposed extension would create a tunnel effect for the lower ground floor habitable room windows at number 59 resulting in a harmful loss of outlook and sense of enclosure which cannot be supported.

3.6 The proposed first floor terrace area would also result in an unacceptable level of overlooking to no. 59. The proposed development is therefore considered to result in a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the lower ground floor flat at no. 59 for the reasons outlined above and cannot be supported

4. Recommendation

4.1 Refuse planning permission