

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>31/08/2017</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>18/10/2017</b>	
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Obote Hope			2017/4547/P			
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
48 Shoot-up Hill London NW2 3QB			Please see Decision Notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>			
<b>Proposal(s)</b>						
The erection of a roof extension over the rear annex wing, enlargement of the rear chimney stack and erection of a dormer to the rear roofslope to create 1 x 2-bed flat and extend existing 1-bed flat.						
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	<b>Refuse Planning Permission</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>	<b>Full Planning Permission</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	Site notice: was displayed from 10/08/2017 - 18/10/2017 Press notice: N/A  No objections received.					
<b>Summary of CAAC response:</b>	N/A					

## Site Description

The application site comprises a three-storey semi-detached building with two storey rear extension located on the eastern side of Shoot Up Hill. It is part of three pairs of semi-detached buildings (38-48) which form a cohesive group.

The host building is not located within a Conservation Area and is not located within the vicinity of any Listed Buildings.

## Relevant History

### Application site

2016/1089/P - Excavation of basement with front and rear lightwells; alteration of the residential mix to comprise 4x1-bed and 3x2-bed units and associated works. Granted 07/09/2016

2017/3856/P - The erection of a rear dormer roof extension for ancillary residential floorspace (Class C3). Refused 30/10/2017

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2012

### The London Plan 2016

### The Camden Local Plan 2017

G1 Delivery and location of growth

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

H6 Housing choice and mix

H7 Large and small homes

T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport

T2 Parking and car-free development

DM1 Delivery and monitoring

### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 - Design

CPG3 - Sustainability

CPG6 - Amenity

CPG7 - Transport

### Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015 (Policies 2 & 8)

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of an additional storey on top of the existing rear extension to provide an additional flat and a dormer extension to the existing rear roof slope to extend an existing flat. The proposed rear dormer extension would measure approximately 4.1m in width, 2.4m in depth and approximately 1.8m in height and the annex wing roof extension would measure approximately 3.9m in height, between 10.0m to 11.8m in depth and 4.6m in width.

Revisions:

The dormer roof extension was not part of the original scheme, and was re-inserted due to the refusal of the rear dormer under application no. 2017/3856/P, refused on 30/10/2017

1.2 The key considerations are as follows:

- Design and appearance of the extension and the impact on the general area;
- Standard of residential development;
- Amenity on neighbouring residential amenities;
- Transport

### 1.3 Design and appearance

#### 1.4 Roof Extension over the rear annex

1.5 Paragraph 7.2 of Local Plan policy D1 (Design), discusses extensions and alterations. The policy states that rear extensions, which compromise the composition of the existing elevation and undermine the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development, would not be acceptable in principle. In this case, it is considered that whilst the pair of buildings (46 & 48) vary in their design and appearance. The group of semi-detached properties which the application site forms a part of (nos. 38-48) are cohesive in their design and scale and the group of buildings feature part one/part two storey rear additions. However, it is noted that the host building was previously extended at rear 1<sup>st</sup> floor level, so unlike the other properties in the group, the rear extension is a full two stories rather than a part one/part two storey addition and is already larger than the rest of the group. In addition, the host building is going through extensive alterations including a proposed basement extension, which would have a cumulative impact on the host building. If permitted the overall development would not be subservient addition and the proposed roof extension over the rear annex would be a storey higher and project further than all of the neighbouring properties. Consequently, the extensions would detract from the uniformity and symmetry of the group of dwelling at a high level.

1.6 The proposed extension is considered to be over development, due to the mass and scale proposed the extension would appear obtrusive in the context of the surrounding properties, and pays no regard to the site or its settings. The proposed extension would not be in keeping with the surrounding pattern of the development within close proximity of the host building nor does the annex wing addition take into consideration the character, setting, context, the form and scale of neighbouring buildings. Consequently, the proposed annex wing extension would be harmful to the appearance of the host property, and neighbouring ones, contrary to policies D1 of Camden Local Plan 2017.

1.7 In relation to the heights of rear extensions, CPG1 (*paragraphs 4.12 - 4.13*) requires development to respect the existing pattern of rear extensions. The guidance re-affirms that in most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged. The proposed extension would result in the two storey closet wing being three stories

high, with a ridge height close that that of the main dwelling and eaves higher than the host building. Along this side of Shoot Up Hill there is a very strong pattern of one and two storey rear closet wings. Therefore, the proposed extension would interrupt this uniformity of the pair of properties to the detriment of the building group and wider area.

### Rear Dormer

- 1.8 The proposed rear dormer is relatively large and would measure approximately 4.1m in width, 2.4m in depth and approximately 1.8m in height. The location and design of the dormer are considered unacceptable. It would sit so low on the rear roof slope that the window cills would be below eaves level which would harm the appearance of the host building and CPG1 advises that dormers should be at least 500mm above the eaves. It would also have an uncomfortable relationship with the roof of the proposed extension as it forms an awkward junction. Furthermore, the guidance states that dormers should generally be aligned with the windows on the lower floors and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows below.
- 1.9 The proposal would also be contrary to the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (FGWNP). Policy 2 (iv) states that development that undermines the architectural style of the property should be resisted. The FGWNP also stipulates that dormer extension should fit within the existing rooflines, which would not be the case in this regard, due to dormer extension awkward design and setting. The Neighbourhood Plan stipulates that 'roof extensions should be in proportionate and should fit into the existing roofline and be in keeping with existing development.

## **2 Standard of residential development**

- 2.1 The proposal aims to provide an additional 1Bed 2P self-contained which would meet the technical space standards of the London Plan 2016, the floor space would be approximately 51sqm. Approximately 8sqm would be below required height of 2.3m. Nevertheless, this element would be in accordance with the 75% requirement of the London Plan 2016. Which requires minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.3m for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area. The flat would mainly have good access to sunlight/daylight, natural ventilation and outlook.
- 2.2 Unit 5 located at roof level would be improved upon due to the proposed dormer extension by an additional 2sqm to 25sqm.

### **Amenity**

- 3.0 Policy A1 of the Local Plan seeks to ensure that the amenities of existing and future occupiers are not unduly impacted by development in terms of visual privacy and overlooking; sunlight, daylight and overshadowing; artificial lighting; noise and vibration etc.
- 3.1 The proposed rear dormer would not exacerbate levels of overlooking nor have an impact with the loss of privacy, the roof of the neighbouring property no. 46 roof is unaltered and there are no existing windows that would be impacted upon. It is not considered that there would be an impact on daylight/sunlight or overshadowing on account of the proposed dormer extension's size, scale and setting.
- 3.2 The proposed extension to the annex is likely to have an adverse impact on the amenity of other residents of the building and to no. 46 in terms of daylight. The application lacks a daylight/sunlight report to demonstrate that the proposal would be in accordance with BRE guidelines. No calculations have been provided to demonstrate that the proposed roof extension would not have a detrimental impact on adjoining second floor windows. In accordance with the BRE guidelines in order to assess whether further daylight analysis is required a '45 degree test' should be applied to assess the proposed extension on neighbouring windows. This has been undertaken by the case officer and this confirms that the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor windows on either side would

fail the 45 degree test, as such, further daylight analysis is required in order to fully assessment the daylight impacts on the neighbouring properties. The case officer has sought the submission of a daylight study, however this has not been forthcoming. As such, the proposal, in the absence of a daylight study to suggest the proposal would likely result in loss of daylight to the neighbouring units.

- 3.3 The neighbouring property no.46 does not benefit from a south facing window to the rear, but Fordwych Court to the north of the site does so the proposal may also impact on sunlight to Fordwych Court, and to a lesser extent daylight. The application lacks the submission of a daylight/sunlight assessment to address amenity issues concerning the impact of the proposal on daylight/sunlight and overshadowing, as such, the proposal would have a detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

#### **4.0 Transport**

- 4.1 In line with Local Plan policy T2 (Parking and car-free development) all new residential development is required to be car-free to reduce car ownership and reduce air pollution and congestion. If the application were acceptable this would be secure by legal agreement, the absence of such would be a reason for refusal.
- 4.2 In line with Local Plan policy T1 (Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport) and the London Plan, new development is required to provide accessible and secure cycle storage. A two bedroom flat would be requires to provide 2x cycle space. No cycle storage is proposed therefore the proposal is contrary to policy T1.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

- 5.1 The roof extension would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the host building, pair of semi-detached properties and the wider group. This would be particularly apparent when viewed in relation to the neighbouring pairs at 38, 40, 42, and 44 Shoot Up Hill as the eaves of the extension would be higher than the eaves of neighbouring buildings. In addition, the host building has already been extended at the rear and the proposed roof extension would tower over the established part one/part two storey rear additions, resulting in a roof addition at the application site being unduly prominent to the detriment of the character and appearance of the group. As such, the roof extension and the rear dormer addition would represent incongruous additions to the host building and would detract from the character and appearance of the host building and the pair of dwellings and the group. The proposed extension would also have detrimental impact on the residential amenity in terms of loss of daylight and sunlight.

**Recommendation:** Refuse Planning Permission