

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>03/04/2018</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>02/03/2018</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Sofie Fieldsend			2018/0297/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
54 Maygrove Road London NW6 2ED			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>					
Erection of a two storey rear extension at lower ground and ground level. Erection of two rear terraces at ground and first floor. Replacement rear window at ground floor and replacement of 2x existing rear windows with doors at ground and first floor level. Infill of front steps to create a bathroom with 1x side window at lower ground level.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Full Planning Permission</b>			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>00</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>A site notice was displayed on the 09/02/2018 and the consultation period expired on the 02/03/2018.</p> <p>One objection was received from Flat A No.56 Maygrove Road.</p> <p>Their objection can be summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of light to ground floor bedroom, which is only served by a set of patio doors. This is incorrectly shown as a window</li> <li>2. Daylight survey shows loss of light to this property and does not include their side window which serves the living room and will face onto the rear extension</li> <li>3. Loss of privacy and overlooking from the proposed terraces looking into bedroom, privacy screens inadequate</li> <li>4. Loss of outlook and noise from the terraces</li> <li>5. Construction concerns relating to debris, potential damage and clean up.</li> </ol> <p><i>Officer response:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Addressed in paragraphs 5.2-5.6</i></li> <li>2. <i>It is noted that this room is also served by a set of patio doors and that this window is not the only source of natural light to this room.</i></li> <li>3. <i>Addressed in section 5.8</i></li> <li>4. <i>Addressed in sections 5.9-5.10</i></li> <li>5. <i>This matter would not substantiate a reason for refusal</i></li> </ol>					

## Site Description

The site is three storey mid terrace property which has been converted into two flats and is located along the Northern side of Maygrove Road. The building is not listed or located within a Conservation Area.

It is noted that along this section of the terrace that properties are characterised by pairs of joint rear closet wings, this application site is an exception as it has no rear projection. The properties either side at No.52 and 54 Maygrove Road have been converted into flats. No.52 consists of three flats and No.56 has been converted into four flats.

## Relevant History

### Application site

**34819** - Change of use including works of conversion to form two self-contained maisonettes.  
**Granted 09/11/1982**

### Neighbouring properties

#### **52 Maygrove Road:**

**23411** - Conversion into 3 flats, new external rear staircase - **Granted (1976)**

#### **56 Maygrove Road:**

**8804134** – Conversion into 4 flats, front/rear roof terraces, rear dormer and single storey rear extension – **Granted (1990)**

## Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

London Plan (2016)

Camden's Local Plan (2017)

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 – Design

Supplementary Guidance

CPG 1 – Design

CPG 6 – Amenity

## Assessment

### Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for a two storey rear extension to flat A measuring:

- 5.4m deep, 5.8m wide and with a max height of 3m at lower ground floor
- 3.75m deep, 3.8m wide at ground floor

1.2 Erection of two rear terraces at ground and first floor each measuring:

- 1.5m deep and 3.8m wide at ground floor
- 2.3m deep and 3.6m wide at first floor

Both terraces will have a 1.5m high opaque glass screening along the sides.

1.3 Replacement rear window at ground floor and replacement of 2x existing rear windows with doors at ground and first floor level.

1.4 Infill of front steps to create a bathroom with 1x side window at lower ground level.

### 3.0 Assessment

3.3 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Design and Appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

### 4.0 Design and Appearance

4.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions are proposed. Policy D1 requires extensions to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; and the character and proportions of the existing building. Camden's design policies are supported by Camden Planning Guidance 1 (Design). Camden Planning Guidance document CPG1 (Design) advises that extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and proportion.

#### Two storey rear extension

4.2 The lower ground floor has a part pitched, part flat roof on the full width extension (5.4m deep and 5.8m wide) which stands at 3m high along the boundary with No.56 Maygrove. Along the boundary with No.52 this decreases to 2m with a rear parapet wall increasing this height to 2.5m. The ground floor extension measures 3.8m wide and 3.75m deep which will be set 0.3m off the boundary with No.56.

4.3 The proposed depth and width of the lower ground floor extension is considered excessive and not in keeping with the prevailing pattern of development within the terrace. It is noted that this row of terrace properties are primarily characterised by half width extensions at this level and a full width extension of this depth would appear out of character. In addition, the depth and width of the proposed closet wing extension at ground floor is considered excessive and contrary to policy and guidance. Being deeper, higher and wider than other similar existing extensions within the terrace the extension is not considered sufficiently subordinate to, or respectful of, the character of the host

building or terrace of which it forms part. It is considered that the excessive height, depth, width, bulk and massing of the two storey extension as proposed would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the host property.

4.4 The proposed powder coated aluminium doors proposed on the lower ground floor elevation and the replacement of the rear window at ground floor and replacement of 2x existing rear windows with painted timber doors at ground and first floor level are not considered to harm the character of the host property. The use of timber is welcomed at the higher levels and aluminium would be acceptable at the lower level given that views would be restricted at this level.

### Terraces

4.5 The proposal includes the creation of two terraces, one above the proposed lower ground floor extension and one at first floor level. It is noted that none of the neighbouring properties have a terrace at first floor level. Both terraces have 1.5m high opaque glass screens proposed along each side. This height is below the height needed for the privacy screening to protect neighbouring amenity (discussed below). It is considered that the proposed screens would appear as incongruous additions that would be out of character with the rear elevation of building and as such a terraces in these locations are unacceptable. Both terraces are considered to cause harm to the character of the host property and the character of this terrace.

### Front alterations

4.6 The Council consider that the principle of infilling the front steps to create a bathroom with 1x side window at lower ground level is acceptable and not considered to have a detrimental impact of the character of the host property or the character of the surrounding area.

### Conclusion

4.7 Overall it is considered that the proposed two storey rear extension by reason of its excessive scale, depth, width, height and detailed design fails to be subordinate to the existing dwelling. The proposed siting and privacy screens of both terraces make them appear as incongruous additions to the host property. These elements of the development are a therefore considered to be a detriment to the character and appearance of the existing building, the street scene and the locality, contrary to policy D1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

## **5.0 Amenity**

5.1 Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected including visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.

### Two storey rear extension

5.2 It is noted that both the adjoining properties at 52 and 56 Maygrove Road have been converted into flats, with three units in No.52 and four units in No.56. Within No.56, Flat A occupies the lower ground floor and flats B and C occupy the ground floor. During the lifetime of this application, revised

plans were received to correctly show the fenestration of the building at No.56 Maygrove Road. The original elevations and the daylight and sunlight assessment submitted by the applicant show 'window 2' which serves the lower ground floor flat (A) incorrectly, the site visit confirmed that a set of patio doors is the only source of light to the bedroom not a window as originally shown. A revised daylight and sunlight assessment was not received to show the correct fenestration.

5.3 The two storey rear extension fails the 45 degree test set out in CPG 1 (Design) and is considered to result in loss of light to Flat A, No.56 Maygrove Road. Therefore it is considered that the two storey rear extension in absence of an accurate sunlight and daylight survey would cause harm to the amenity of Flat A, No.56 Maygrove Road in terms of loss of light. However, it is noted that 'window 2' in the report would have failed the standards outlined in the BRE guidance and an updated report showing the correct fenestration would have been required to confirm that it still fails.

5.4 The set of patio doors to Flat A of No.56 serves as the only source of daylight to this bedroom. Due to this flat's limited outlook and excessive height and depth on the boundary, the extension would also result in a tunnelling effect for appearing overbearing and resulting in an unacceptable sense of enclosure for adjoining neighbours at Flat A No.56. The 0.3m set off from this boundary at ground floor is not sufficient to overcome this adverse impact on the amenity.

5.5 On site it was noted that the neighbouring flat at no. 52 also contains a window facing the shared boundary directly onto the proposed extension. The height of the lower ground floor extension on the boundary has been reduced to 2m high to match the existing boundary, given this lower height at lower ground floor and as the ground floor extension is set 1.5m from the boundary with No.52 it is not considered to result in a harmful loss of outlook and sense of enclosure to the flats in this neighbouring building.

5.6 The replacement of a rear window at ground floor and replacement of 2x existing rear windows with doors at ground and first floor level is not considered to result in an unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property's amenity given that the new window and door although larger than the existing windows would have a similar siting to the existing windows.

## Terraces

5.7 CPG1 outlines that although balconies can provide additional amenity space they can also create issues of privacy, daylight, noise, light spillage and security.

5.8 Both terraces have 1.5m high opaque glass screens proposed along each side. It is considered that any screening would need to be a minimum of 1.7m high to reduce issues of overlooking into the adjoining properties. Both proposed terraces would therefore create issues of overlooking into neighbouring habitable rooms within No.52 and Flat A and C of 56 Maygrove Road and exacerbate existing overlooking into neighbouring private gardens. It is considered that the proposed 1.5m high screens along the sides of both terraces are not enough to overcome this issue.

5.9 Concerns were also raised about the loss of outlook created by both terraces to flat A of No.56, it is noted that both terraces are set 0.3m away from the boundary with No.56. It is considered that this distance is not sufficient and therefore the balcony screening when combined with the two storey rear

extension increases the depth of the ground floor extension and further increases the height of the two storey extension. This is considered to add to the sense of enclosure and outlook to this property.

5.10 Concerns were also raised about additional noise created by the terraces. Flat A of the application site has sole access of the rear garden and will gain a 5sqm terrace at ground floor, it is considered that this property would be more likely to use the existing garden for large groups of people. Flat B will have larger terrace of 7.7sqm at first floor due to its scale is not able to accommodate a large number of people and whilst it is acknowledged that this balcony may contribute to additional noise, it is not to the extent that would warrant a separate reason for refusal.

#### Front alterations

5.11 Given the siting, scale and separation distance to neighbouring properties from the infill extension under the front steps, it is not considered to harm the amenity of any neighbouring property. The proposed side window on this extension at lower ground level will face onto a boundary wall and will not create issues of overlooking or loss of privacy to either neighbouring property.

### **6.0 Conclusion**

6.1 The proposed two storey rear extension has an unacceptable impact on the character of the host property and subsumes the building with its excessive mass, depth and height. The terraces and their proposed screening appear as incongruous additions which cause harm to the character of the host property and adjoining terrace which it is part of.

6.2 Both proposed balconies are considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy to the adjoining flats at the two lower floors of No.52 and Flat A and C of No. 56 due their siting and lack of adequate screening. In addition the two storey rear extension when combined with the proposed terraces it is considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity resulting in a loss of light to flat A at No.56 and an increased sense of enclosure to this flat and the flat directly above.

6.3 To conclude the proposed two storey rear extension and rear terraces are contrary to CPG1 and CPG6 and policies A1 and D1 of Camden's Local Plan.

### **7.0 Recommendation**

7.1 Refuse planning permission.