

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	04/07/2018
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	14/07/2018
Officer			Application Numbers	
Samir Benmbarek			2018/2127/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
Flat 3 Hillcrest Lodge 40 Shoot-Up Hill London NW2 3QB			See Decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of single storey rear extension at first floor level over existing roof terrace and relocation of associated existing access door to rear elevation				
Recommendation:	Refuse Planning Permission			
Application Type:	Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	--	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Multiple site notices were displayed in close proximity to the application site on 20/06/2018 (expiring on 14/07/2018). To date, one objection has been received from the following address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 36 Shoot-Up Hill <p>The above have objected/commented on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct overlooking and loss of privacy • Previous Council guidance for neighbouring buildings advised no further extensions into the rear as the site and its surroundings are already built up leading to loss of amenity. • The proposal is a bulky addition that would unbalance the pair of buildings (with No. 38 Shoot-Up Hill) • Concerns of loss of daylight and sunlight • Clarification on the neighbouring boundary- a portion of the garden that was in the domain of No. 40 Shoot-Up Hill is now of No. 36. <p>Officer's Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Please refer to paragraph 3.3 of this report</i> • <i>Each application is reviewed on a case by case basis. The proposal is within the envelope of the application building.</i> • <i>Please refer to paragraph 2.7 of this report</i> • <i>Please refer to paragraph 3.4 of this report</i> • <i>Upon site visit, it is acknowledged that a portion of the rear garden has been transferred to No. 38. The proposal is not being developed on this portion of land, nor does it affect it.</i> 					
CAAC/ National Amenity Society comments:	The Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum were formally consulted. To date, no response has been received.					

Site Description

The application is related to a rear first floor one-bedroom studio flat within a two-storey semi-detached building located on the eastern side of Shoot-Up Hill. The property is not located within a conservation area, nor is it a Listed Building. The building is located within the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan area.

Previously, a ground floor side extension/projection formed part of the building but was separated off as an independent unit in the 1990s to form No. 40A Shoot-Up Hill.

Shoot-Up Hill is a main thoroughfare into Central London from Northwest London in which is surrounding area is predominantly residential. Shoot-Up Hill also forms the borough boundary, with LB Camden to the east and LB Brent to the west.

Relevant History

No. 40 Shoot- Up Hill (Application Building)

(Ref: 2012/2118/P)- Planning permission refused on 18/06/2012 for the erection of a single storey rear extension at first floor level with rooflight, new windows to north west elevation, replacement of existing balustrade to existing roof terrace at first floor level to residential flat (Class C3).

(Ref: 2012/2120/P)- Planning permission granted on 18/06/2012 for the excavation of a rear lightwell with skylight enclosed by low brick wall with balustrade to extend existing basement, replacement of rear door with sash window and insertion of new windows on north west elevation to ground floor flat (Class C3).

(Ref: 2013/1842/P)- Planning permission refused on 23/05/2013 for the erection of a single storey rear extension at first floor level with rooflight, new windows to north west elevation, replacement of existing balustrade to existing roof terrace at first floor level to residential flat (Class C3).

No.40A Shoot-Up Hill:

No relevant planning application history.

No. 38 Shoot- Up Hill

No relevant planning application history

No. 36 Shoot- Up Hill

(Ref: 2016/6135/P)- Householder permission granted on 21/02/2016 for the Erection of single storey ground floor extension to front elevation. Partial demolition of existing first floor and erection of an enlarged replacement extension. Insertion of skylights to ground and roof level. Replacement windows and doors throughout

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2018

The London Plan 2016

Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 (Managing the impact of development)
D1 (Design)

Camden Supplementary Planning Guidance

CGP1 Design (Updated March 2018)

Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015

Policy 2 (Design and character)

1. Proposal

1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension at first floor level over the existing flat roof terrace.

1.2 The proposed rear extension will have a pitched roof and stock brick and would feature UPVC framed windows, 1 rooflight and roof tiles. The proposed rear extension would have a depth of 4.5m, a width of 5.0m and a maximum height of 3.3m from the existing first floor (exterior) level to the top of the proposed pitch (5.9 from ground level).

1.3 The main issues for consideration are:

- The impact of the proposal upon the character or appearance of the host building and the surrounding area;
- The impact the proposal may have upon the amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

2. Design

2.1 Along the eastern side of Shoot-Up Hill, there are 3 pairs of semi-detached buildings which are Nos. 38 & 40, Nos. 42 & 44 and Nos. 46 & 48 respectively from south to north. To the rear of No. 38 is No. 36 Shoot-Up Hill which is a two-storey detached dwellinghouse. The semi-detached buildings all feature closet wings at ground and first floor levels. At ground floor level, these closet wings have been extended; however at first floor level there have been no extensions and the rear elevations at first floor level remain largely intact, in particular the pair forming of the application property and its neighbour (No. 40 and No. 38).

2.2 Overall, within the immediate area, the pattern of the existing roofscape and 1st floor rear elevations along the eastern side of Shoot-Up Hill has not been influenced by roof or rear extensions and the group of buildings remain unaltered at roof level.

2.3 The Council's design policies within the Camden Local Plan are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained in policy D1 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 used.

2.4 In considering the proposal against CPG1 (Design), rear extensions should be designed to:

- Be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- Not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing, light pollution/spillage, privacy/overlooking, and sense of enclosure.

2.5 Furthermore, within CPG1, the guidance strongly discourages extensions that are higher than one full storey beneath the original eaves level of the building or raise above the general height of the building.

2.6 Within the preceding context, the proposed first floor rear extension is considered unacceptable, given that the extension would be developed at first floor level of a two-storey building and therefore would not terminate at one full storey beneath the original eaves. The roof pitch of the proposed double-pitched extension would terminate above the eaves and is considered to compete with the roof of the main building (and the building itself). The proposal would also alter and disjoint the existing roof profile of the building by introducing a design that

over-complicates it.

2.7 The proposal is also considered unduly large and bulky in relation to the existing building, and furthermore, appears to be an awkwardly-designed addition to the building. Due to its bulk and awkward positioning, the proposed rear extension would dominate and harm the appearance of the building to rear and side elevation of the building. The rear extension would also create an unbalance between the pair of buildings by introducing further bulk on one side.

2.8 The detailed design of the proposal, including the materials, rooflight and windows, is considered appropriate. However, this does not overcome the unacceptability of the principle, bulk and scale of the first floor rear extension. The proposed new door to the original rear elevation, relocating the existing access door at first floor level, is considered acceptable.

2.9 Overall, the proposal is unacceptable in design terms as it would introduce a bulky and incongruous addition that would dominate the existing building, alter an unimpaired roofscape and imbalance the pair of semi-detached buildings.

3. Amenity

3.1 Within the Local Plan, protecting the quality of life for occupiers and neighbours is important. In particular, policy A1 ensures that development will not cause adverse impacts upon neighbouring occupiers in terms of sunlight, daylight, outlook and privacy and overlooking.

3.2 Due to the depth of the proposed first floor rear extension, it is considered that the proposal would not lead to an adverse impact of outlook towards the neighbouring occupiers, in particular No. 38 and No. 36, which closely adjoin at the side and rear where the extension would be located. The first floor extension would still be contained within the envelope of the building and would not encroach further from it.

3.3 The proposed extension would be developed upon an existing first floor level terrace in which there is already overlooking (which is typical for a rear residential setting). Although the proposal would result in the built form being brought further back towards the rear of the building, it would not result in an increase of overlooking into neighbouring buildings as these can be achieved in its current setting. The proposed extension does not feature any side windows.

3.4 The proposed extension, by reason of its size and position, would not harm the existing levels of daylight and sunlight currently experienced by neighbouring occupiers.

3.5 Overall, the proposal is considered to not adversely harm the amenity of adjoining residential occupiers.

4. Recommendation

Refuse Planning Permission on design and bulk grounds.