

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>28/08/2018</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>30/07/2018</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Sofie Fieldsend			2018/2702/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 2 storey extension at lower ground floor level including terrace at first floor level. Replacement of rear window at ground floor level and replacement of rear window with door at first floor 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>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
			No. electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>A site notice was displayed on the 06/07/2018 and the consultation period expired on the 30/07/2018.</p> <p>No responses were received during the consultation period.</p>					
<b>Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood forum</b>	<p>Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood forum were consulted and no response was received.</p>					

## 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

**2018/0297/P** – 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. – **Refused 03/04/2018**

### Reasons for refusal:

- 1) The proposed two storey rear extension and balconies, by reason of their scale, bulk, depth, width, height and detailed design would overwhelm the rear elevations of the host property and its adjoining neighbours and would cumulatively constitute discordant and disproportionate additions harming the wider terrace and locality generally contrary to policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 2) The proposed development, by reason of its height, scale and depth results in a harmful loss of light and a sense of enclosure to the adjoining building of No.56 Maygrove Road and specifically Flat A, contrary to policy A1 (Managing the impact of development ) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.
- 3) The proposed balconies, by reason of their position and proximity results in a loss of privacy to the adjoining buildings, specifically to the two lower floors of No.52 and Flat A and C of No.56 Maygrove Road, contrary to policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017

**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 (2018)

### London Plan (2016)

### Camden's Local Plan (2017)

Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 – Design

### Supplementary Guidance

CPG 1 – Design (2015 updated 2018)

CPG 6 – Amenity (2011 updated 2018)

CPG Amenity

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

Policy 2: Design and Character

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

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

- 5.4m deep, 5.6m wide and with a max height of 3m at lower ground floor
- 3.75m deep and 4m wide at ground floor

1.2 Erection of a rear terrace at first floor to serve flat B measuring 2.4m deep and 3.6m wide. The terrace will be enclosed by a 1.7m high opaque glass privacy screen

1.3 Replacement rear window at ground floor and replacement of one first floor rear window with a door.

### 2. Background

2.1 Changes between the current application and the previously refused scheme (ref. 2018/0297/P):

- Tapering of one corner of ground floor extension on side adjacent to No.56 Maygrove Road (no reduction in width or depth)
- Reduction in width of lower ground extension by 0.2m and increase in the width of the ground floor extension by 0.2m
- Increase in height of proposed first floor balcony from 1.5m high to 1.7m and change of materials from railings to opaque glass.
- Removal of ground floor terrace
- Replacement of proposed double doors at ground level with a single sash window
- Reduction of number of lower ground rooflights from 3 to 2 proposed
- Removal of proposed front alterations
- Sunlight and daylight report with correct fenestration of the neighbouring property at No.56

### 3.0 Assessment

3.1 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.

4.2 Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan seeks that all development shall be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead. It further states that extensions - and infill development - being in character and proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties. Also that development which 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.

#### 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 5.6m wide) which stands at 3m high along the boundary with No.56 Maygrove. Along the boundary with No.52 this decreases to 2.1m (1.8m when measured from No.52's land level) with a rear parapet wall increasing this height to 2.5m. The ground floor extension measures 4m wide and 3.75m deep which will be set 0.1m 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. The inclusion of a small tapered corner to this ground floor extension is not considered to significantly reduce its bulk. 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 first floor with a painted timber door 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 a terrace at first floor level which is enclosed with a 1.7m opaque glass privacy screen. It is noted that none of the neighbouring properties have a terrace at first floor level and that the dimensions proposed have not been altered from the previously refused scheme. The revised design is considered to represent a poorer quality of design which appears dominant and more solid than the railings proposed in the previous application. While it is acknowledged that the height and material change from the previous scheme of this screen would address the third reason for refusal relating to the loss of privacy to the adjoining buildings it is considered that the proposed screen would appear as an incongruous addition that would be out of character with the rear elevation of building and as such a terrace in these locations are unacceptable. The terrace by reason of its siting, design, materials and scale is considered to cause harm to the character of the host property and the character of this terrace.

## Conclusion

4.6 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 screen of the first floor terrace makes it appear as an incongruous addition to the host property. These elements of the development are 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 and Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015).

## **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. The two storey rear extension fails the 45 degree test set out in CPG Amenity and is considered to result in loss of light to Flat A, No.56 Maygrove Road. In addition window 2' in the daylight report submitted fails the standards outlined in the BRE guidance as it results in over a 39% loss of annual probable sunlight hours and a 23% loss in the vertical sky component which is less than 0.8 times the existing value. Therefore it is considered that the two storey rear extension would cause harm to the amenity of Flat A, No.56 Maygrove Road in terms of loss of light.

5.3 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 0.1m set off from this boundary at ground floor is not sufficient to overcome this adverse impact on the amenity.

5.4 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.

5.5 The replacement of a rear window at ground floor and replacement existing rear windows with a door at 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

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

5.7 The first floor terrace will be enclosed by a 1.7m opaque glass privacy screen. It is considered that the proposed height and materials although harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and this row of terrace properties it would be significant to address previous concerns and a reason for refusal about overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

5.8 The first floor terrace would be 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 loss of outlook to this property. The previous reason for refusal has therefore that been addressed or overcome.

### 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 first floor terrace and its proposed screening would appear as incongruous additions which cause harm to the character of the host property and adjoining terrace which it is part of.

6.2 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 and Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015). This scheme does not overcome all the previous reasons for refusal.

### 7.0 Recommendation

7.1 Refuse planning permission.

