| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | 18/09/2017 | |
|---|------------------|----------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------|--|
| (Refusal) | | N/A | | Consultation Expiry Date: | 17/08/2017 | |
| Officer | | | Application N | umber(s) | | |
| Patrick Marfleet | | | 2017/3834/P | | | |
| Application Address | | | Drawing Numbers | | | |
| The Coach House, 26A Upper Park Road London NW3 2UT | | | See decision notice | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signat | ure C&UD | Authorised O | fficer Signature | | |
| İ | | | | | | |
| Proposal | (2) | | | | | |

Proposal(s)

Erection of single storey roof extension at second floor level to provide additional habitable space to existing dwelling (C3).

| Recommendation(s): | Refuse planning permission | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------|----------|-------------------|----|--|--|--|
| Application Type: | Full Planning Permission | | | | | | | | |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Decision Notice | | | | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | No of response | 0.4 | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | No. notified | 00 | No. of responses No. electronic | 04 04 | No. of objections | 03 | | | |
| Summary of consultation responses: | Press notice: 27/07/2017 - 17/08/2017 Three objections were received from neighbouring residents and the following concerns were raised: 1. Proposal would cause loss of amenity to No.26 Upper Park Road and significant loss of light to communal stairwell window. 2. Proposal would result in impact to outlook from side windows of No.26 and result in increased sense of enclosure. 3. The proposed mansard extension would negatively impact the appearance of host and neighbouring buildings and would neither preserve nor enhance surrounding conservation area. | | | | | | | | |
| | this repo | nity im _l rt. nity im _l | pact of the proposal is | | | | | | |

| | The design/conservation impact of the proposal is discussed in paragraph 2.2 of this report. |
|-----------------------------|--|
| CAAC/Local groups comments: | Parkhill CAAC: Wrote to confirm that they have no objection. |

Site Description

The application site is located on the south eastern side of Upper Park Road and relates to a two storey plus basement, Coach House type dwelling. The property reads as an ancillary side extension to the flank elevation of No.26 Upper Park Road, which is a four storey semi-detached Victorian villa that has been divided into flats. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character comprising large pairs of semi-detached Victorian villas with small infill extensions to the side which are largely in use as independent C3 dwellings.

The application property is located within the Parkhill Conservation Area, it is not a listed building but does adjoin a building (No.26 Upper Park Road) identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area.

Relevant History

Application Site

2016/1111/P - Addition of a mansard roof extension, with 1 no. front facing dormer, 1 no. rear facing dormer and 1 no. rear roof terrace and changes to the front facade comprising a replacement door and windows and new smooth rendered finish.

Refused on 22/08/2016 due to the unacceptable impact the proposal would have on the character of the host dwelling and surrounding conservation area and the amenity of neighbouring residents.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

The London Plan March 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

G1 Delivery and location of growth

A1 Managing the impact of development

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance 2011/2015

CPG1 (Design)

CPG6 (Amenity)

Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011

Assessment

1.0 PROPOSAL

- 1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey, mansard type roof extension to provide additional habitable space for the occupants of the existing two storey plus basement single dwelling (C3). Permission is also sought to increase the height of the existing front parapet wall by approximately 400mm.
- 1.2 The proposal would be setback from the front elevation of the existing property by 3m and have a maximum height of 2.5m, a depth of 6.7m and a width of 4.7m. The extension would be clad in natural slate tiles and fitted with two conservation style roof lights to the front and a projecting glazed element to the rear.

Revisions

- 1.3 Officers note that an application for a similar development at the site was refused on 22/08/2016 (ref: 2016/1111/P) on design and amenity grounds. The current application has sought to address the previous reasons for refusal. Amendments to the previous refusal include the removal of the third floor rear terrace area, a 400mm reduction in the overall height of the extension, an increased set-back of 3m (1.2m more than the refused scheme) from the front elevation and the replacement of the front dormer with two conservation roof lights.
- 1.4 The proposed amendments have addressed some of the concerns from the previous application, including the amenity impact of the proposed roof terrace and the inappropriate use of aluminium windows. Despite the improvements, the size, design and location of the proposed development is considered unacceptable in principle (as addressed below). It is for this reason why no revisions to the proposed plans have been sought.

2.1 ASSESSMENT

The material considerations for this application are summarised as follows:

- Design and Conservation;
- Amenity of neighbouring residential occupants;

2.2 <u>Design and Conservation</u>

- 2.2.1 Local Plan Policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) aim to achieve high quality design in all developments. Policy D1 requires development to be of the highest architectural and urban design quality, which improves the function, appearance and character of the area; and Policy D2 states that the Council will preserve, and where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas and listed buildings.
- 2.2.2 Paragraph 4.16 of the Council's supplementary design guidance document CPG1 states that side extensions should be no taller than the porch of the main building to which it adjoins.
- 2.2.3 This design requirement with regard to side infill extensions is reiterated in the Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011), which states:

'Where infill extensions are acceptable in principle they should be no more than two storeys in height with the highest part of the extension no higher than the line of the cornice to the front porch. Mansard roofs and entrance doors into the side extension are not considered acceptable'.

- 2.2.4 The application site is an infill development that reads as a subservient side extension to the main dwelling at No.26. The above guidance is considered particularly relevant in this instance. The proposed roof extension would create an additional third storey at the site (when viewed from the front) that would extend 600mm beyond the front porch cornice of the main dwelling to which it adjoins, creating an incongruous and disproportionate addition as a result, which is contrary to the aims of Policy D1 and the Council's supplementary design guidance.
- 2.2.5 With regard to dormer windows, paragraph 5.11(d) of Camden's supplementary design guidance document CPG1 states: 'In number, form, scale and pane size, the dormer and window should relate to the façade below. They should generally be aligned with windows on the lower floors and be of a size that is clearly subordinate to the windows below.'

 Furthermore, with regard to conservatories paragraph 4.19 states: Conservatories should be located at ground or basement level. Only in exceptional circumstances will conservatories be allowed on upper levels. This last relevant is relevant to the upper level glazed extension, which has the qualities of a conservatory (i.e. it is mostly glazed).
- 2.2.6 The size, scale and design of the rear glazed projection is considered to represent an out of scale and dominant addition that would be at odds with the original character of the host property. It would fail to relate or appear subordinate to the fenestration hierarchy of the existing rear elevation and would read as an unsightly addition that would significantly detract from the appearance of the Coach House from the rear.
- 2.2.7 The difference in height between the application site (No. 26A) and the adjacent Coach House extension at No.24 currently provides a degree of visual relief between the two structures and allows for their massing and form to be broken up; thus lessening their impact when viewed from the street. Raising the height of the parapet and introducing a mansard structure at No.26 would result in the appearance of a solid and overbearing development that would unbalance the propoprtions of the modest Coach House and detract from the original character and setting of the surrounding conservation area, contrary to Policy D2 of the Camden Local Plan.
- 2.2.8 It should also be noted that the existing second floor mansard type roof extension to the neighbouring property at 24 Upper Park Road appears to have been granted permission in 1977 (CTP/F9/17/3/24876), a decision which significantly predates the Council's current design, conservation and heritage policies (D1 and D2) which the current application has been assessed against and found contrary to. Furthermore, the existing extension at No.24 (Coach House) only serves to demonstrate the damaging impact roof extensions of this nature have on the character of a positive contributor and is a clear in situ indicator of the damage that this type of proposal would cause to the surrounding conservation area.
- 2.2.9 Special attention has been paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the conservation area under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013. The proposed extension is not considered acceptable as it would represent an incongruous and uncharacteristic feature that would fail to preserve or enhance the character of the surrounding conservation area.
- 2.3 Amenity of neighbouring residential occupants

Daylight/Sunlight/Outlook/Privacy

2.3.1 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, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 (Amenity) provides specific guidance with regards

to privacy, overlooking and outlook.

- 2.3.2 A number of concerns have been raised from neighbouring residents with regard to the loss of light to the communal stairwell area of No.26 that would occur as a result of the development, particularly given the development's close proximity to associated flank elevation window. Whilst officers acknowledge that the front elevation of the proposal would be located close to the stairwell window, its overall size and height is not considered to cause an unacceptable loss of amenity to the occupiers of No.26, particularly as the window serves a communal hallway area and not a habitable room. Openings serving circulation space are not given as much weight in planning considerations as those serving habitable rooms such as living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms.
- 2.3.3 The proposed window to the rear of the extension would share the same outlook as the existing ground and first floor rear windows at the property and is not considered to exacerbate current levels of overlooking at the site.

3.0 Recommendation

3.1 Refuse Planning Permission

