

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	08/03/2018
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	07/02/2018
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Stuart Clapham			2017/6346/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
8 Aldred Road London NW6 1AN			Refer to Decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of single storey rear extension including infill of outrigger and installation of rear canopy at lower ground floor level. Alterations to rear fenestration and roof of outrigger. Erection of rear dormer extension. Installation of new windows and door to front lower ground bay window.				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission		
Application Type:		Householder Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice
Informatives:	
Consultations	
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed between 17/01/2018 and 07/02/2018</p> <p>4 objections were received by the owners/occupiers of 98 Hillfield Road, 96 Hillfield Road, 2 Orestes Mews and 3 Orestes Mews.</p> <p><u>Summary of objections</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Excessive overlooking and privacy from new windows 2. Noise from the increased intensity of use from a roof terrace 3. Excessive disruption from construction (noise, parking) 4. Impact on property values 5. Excessive massing of the proposed development 6. Design (including window style and terraces) out of keeping with local character 7. Dust and debris during construction <p><u>Officer comments</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. See 2.12-2.14 2. No roof terrace was included in either original or revised plans. 3. While this is not a material planning consideration, any approved development would be expected to adhere to the relevant building control regulations. The proposed scale of construction would not merit a Construction Management Plan 4. This is not a material planning consideration 5. See 2.8 and 2.9. Additionally, the revised proposal omits the first floor rear extension. 6. See 2.6-2.9. 7. This is primarily an environmental health concern (rather than a material planning consideration). Nevertheless, any construction would be bound by relevant environmental health regulations.

Site Description

The application site is a three-storey terraced house just outside the West End Green Conservation Area. To the rear of the house is a semi-detached outrigger shared with No. 9 with a hipped roof. To the front is a full-height bay window extending down into the front lightwell, which retains its original corncicing. The property is located in the middle of a terrace of identically constructed houses. The rear of several of these houses have seen alterations including roof and first floor extensions, but all retain a clear integrity of their original built form.

Relevant History

2017/4526/P 4 Aldred Road

External alterations to existing C3 dwelling including erection of single storey side and rear infill extension at lower ground floor level.

Granted householder consent 04/12/2017

2015/3194/P 5 Aldred Road

Creation of habitable space within existing void below the main building and lowering of floor level; construction of new access steps to basement in front garden together with new boundary wall and iron balustrade; alterations to openings

Granted householder consent 12/02/2016

2013/5334/P 9 Aldred Road

Erection of a extension at roof level following the replacement of existing window the installation of new door and railings for the formation of a Juliet balcony to the rear elevation, the installation of 2 x rooflights to front roof slope the installation of new window to the front elevation at basement level and the installation of new railings at front boundary of existing residential dwelling (Class C3).

Granted householder consent 14/10/2013

2012/1216/P 12a Aldred Road

Erection of single storey rear extension at first floor level and creation of roof terrace with glazed balustrade above and alterations to rear dormer window to include doors all in connection with existing flat (Class C3)

Refused full planning permission 02/05/2012

2012/0741/P 2 Aldred Road

Erection of a single storey rear ground floor level extension in connection with existing dwellinghouse (Class C3).

Granted householder consent 04/04/2012

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2016)

Camden Local Plan (2017)

Amenity

A1 – Managing the impact of development

Design

D1 - Design

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015) (FGWHNP)

Policy 2 – Design and Character

Camden Planning Guidance

- CPG 1 – Design
 - o Chapter 4 (Extensions, alterations and conservatories)
 - o Chapter 5 (Roofs, terraces and balconies)
- CPG 6 – Amenity
 - o Chapter 6 (Daylight and sunlight)
 - o Chapter 7 (Overlooking, privacy and outlook)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for:

- Erection of single storey rear extension including the infill of the existing outrigger (8.7m (L) x 1.5m (W) x 2.7m (H) and installation of full-width 1m-deep rear canopy at lower ground floor level.
- Alterations to rear fenestration, including replacement of rear timber doors with larger, aluminium framed sliding doors and replacement of 5 x timber sash windows with larger aluminium framed windows and replacement of one first floor timber-framed sash window on the host building with “hit and miss” brickwork.
- Replacement of the existing hipped roof of outrigger with a part flat, part-pitched roof, with a 4.2 x 1m rooflight on the flat section.
- Erection of a full width (5m) dormer roof extension, with a fully glazed rear elevation formed of full-height metal-framed windows.
- Installation of new windows and door to front lower ground bay window.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in relation to the changes are the design and the impact on amenity

Design

2.2 The Council’s design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 requires extensions to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; the quality of materials to be used; and the character and proportions of the existing building.

Rear extensions

2.3 CPG1 requires that rear extensions should

- 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;
- respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space;

2.4 Policy 2 of the FGWHNP requires that development has regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of its context (including the scale, mass, orientation, pattern and grain of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces) (point iv), and also specifically that extensions are in character and proportion with their context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties (point vii).

Fenestration

2.5 CPG1 states that

- Where it is necessary to alter or replace windows that are original or in the style of the

originals, they should be replaced like with like wherever possible in order to preserve the character of the property and the surrounding area.

- New windows should match the originals as closely as possible in terms of type, glazing patterns and proportions (including the shape, size and placement of glazing bars), opening method, materials and finishes, detailing and the overall size of the window opening.

Roof

2.6 CPG 1 (5.20) considers that roof alterations should have a sympathetic design and relationship to the main building. It further seeks that materials, such as clay tiles, slate, lead or copper, that visually blend with existing materials, are preferred for roof alterations and repairs (5.9).

Proposed rear extension and alterations

2.7 The current outrigger is part of an identical conjoined pair, and along a run of homogenous outriggers with similar massing, materials, detailing, fenestration and roof design. Some of these have been altered with the addition of part-length roof-terraces or first floor extensions, however they all retain their overall integrity and are characterised by symmetrical hipped roof ends, timber framed sash windows, and broader materials and detailing.

2.8 While the reintroduction of traditional slate roof tiles would help to reunite the roofscape, the demolition of the existing hipped roof and replacement with a part-flat, part-hipped roof (with a rooflight on the flat roof) would destroy the symmetry of the overall outrigger and harm the character of the pair of buildings and the overall rear streetscape. The proposed parapet wall with soldier course detailing would also be incongruent with the neighbouring building. The amended fenestration, with large aluminium framed windows placed without vertical alignment or uniform spacing, would harm the character of the building and be unsympathetic to the context. Furthermore, the loss of timber sash windows on the outrigger and the replacement of the rear first floor sash window to the north of host building with a “hit and miss” brick wall would be considered harmful to the character of the building and be non-compliant with CPG4.7 (Windows) which considers that these features should be retained.

2.9 The scale of the proposed rear extension is considered appropriate in design terms. However, the use of concrete is not part of the materials palette of the street. While the council welcomes the use of contemporary design where it responds to its context (Camden Local Plan 7.3), the use of concrete for the construction of the lower ground floor extension is considered to give the impression of excessive bulk and to compete with, rather than complement, the character of the existing outrigger. It also fails to respect the character and detailing of the rear outriggers in this terrace, contrary to Camden Local Plan policy D1 and FGWHNP Policy 2 (particularly point vii). While this rear extension would not be visible from the public realm, this would still cause significant harm to the local character considering that the site is significantly overlooked by neighbouring buildings.

Proposed roof extension

2.10 The site is situated on a street characterised by rear roof extensions, and as such the principle of a roof extension is acceptable. The specific proposed design is for the erection of a full-width roof extension, incorporating a fully-glazed aluminium-framed rear elevation. The overall massing is considered appropriate for the specific context. However, while recognising the applicant's intention for a lightweight roof addition, the resulting design is considered flimsy and not of a high quality design, particularly considering that it would be highly visible from neighbouring properties at the rear. It would furthermore be incongruous with neighbouring roof extensions on the street, which have a more robust appearance. Additionally, while the proposed design does leave a setback of 500mm from the rear elevation of the host building, the complete removal of the rear pitched roof would result in the creation of an eaves gutter behind the newly-constructed parapet, contrary to CPG1 5.11d which states that “deep fascias and eaves gutters should be avoided”.

Proposed front alterations

2.11 The application includes the insertion of two full-length windows and a set of doors to the bay window at the level of the front lower ground lightwell. The design and materials of this component are

considered to be sympathetic to the building, and would be appropriate in the broader context of a diversity of styles of front lightwell fenestration along the street.

Amenity

2.12 Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The Council's amenity guidance CPG6 further details that development should be designed to minimise the impact of the loss of daylight, sunlight, artificial light levels, outlook and privacy.

2.13 The side infill extension would be 2.7m high wall along the boundary with No. 7, approximately 1.7m higher than the current boundary wall. Considering that No. 7 is set down 0.5m from this property, the additional height of the side infill extension combined by its proximity to the windows and doors of habitable rooms at No. 7 (approx. 1.5m from the outrigger), would impact on the daylight and sunlight afforded to the neighbouring property. It is noted that this impact is similar to what could be constructed under Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended). Significant weight is given to the applicant's fallback position under permitted development as there is a reasonable expectation that the permitted development rights could be exercised by the applicant. Given this, it is not considered the impact on amenity could sustain a reason for refusal in this particular instance.

2.14 The proposal includes installation of larger windows to the side extension of the building than currently exist. While this may result in an increase in overlooking and reduced privacy to the windows and external amenity areas of No. 7, this is not considered to be harmful.

2.15 The erection of the roof extension will generate additional overlooking to Oreste Mews and Hillfield Road. The distance between the roof extension and these windows will be compliant with the 18m considered as good practice in CPG6 (Amenity). Additionally, in the case of Oreste Mews, there appears to be limited overlooking of habitable rooms. As such, the amenity impact of the roof extension is considered acceptable.

3.0 Conclusion

3.1 Refuse planning permission