

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>10/09/2018</b>
		N/A	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>09/09/2018</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Nora-Andreea Constantinescu			2018/3363/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
56 Dartmouth Park Road London NW5 1SN			See draft 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>				
Demolition of existing rear structure and erection of single storey rear extension with green roof, to single family dwelling (Class C3).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission		
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application		

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	Site notices Press notice	<b>15/08/18-08/09/18</b> <b>16/08/18-09/09/18</b>	No. of responses	<b>2</b>	No. of objections	<b>2</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>The neighbouring occupiers at nos. 54 and 58 Dartmouth Park Road objected to the proposed scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The measurements provided on the plans are limited.</li> <li>- The drawings do not show the extension at no. 54 Dartmouth Park Road and are inaccurate.</li> <li>- The height of the extension will adversely impact the sunlight and plantings on the patio, through overshadowing.</li> <li>- Overlooking into no. 56 due to the angled rear elevation</li> <li>- Light spill</li> </ul>					
<b>Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum</b>  <b>Dartmouth Park CAAC</b>	No comments received.					

## Site Description

The site is a 3 storey detached dwelling house located on the northern side of Dartmouth Park Road. Dartmouth Park Road slopes down from east to west providing views across the roof slopes of the properties along Dartmouth Park Road. The building is not listed but is located within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area to which it makes a positive contribution.

## Relevant History

2011/1888/P - Installation of solar panels to front at roof level to existing dwelling house (Class C3). – Refused 27/05/2011

2011/5032/P - Installation of replacement windows from aluminium to uPVC to front elevation of existing dwelling house (Class C3). – Refused 26/01/2012

2018/4021/P - Installation of 2 no. solar panels on west facing side roof. (LDC) – Granted 13/09/2018

2018/3591/P - Replacement of window on west elevation with a door and fanlight above, installation of rooflight on the outrigger rear roof slope, enlargement of window at first floor to rear elevation. -- pending consideration

2018/3444/P - Widening of existing dormer window in the rear roof slope by 800mm - pending consideration

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2018)

### London Plan (2016)

Policy 7.4 – Local Character

Policy 7.6 – Architecture

### Camden Local Plan (2017)

Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth

Policy DM1 Delivery and monitoring

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy A3 Biodiversity

### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG 1 – Design updated 2018 – chapters 2, 3, 4

CPG 6 – Amenity 2018 – chapters 5, 6, 7

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the demolition of existing rear ground floor structure and extension of full width rear extension.

1.2 The proposed extension would have:

- A width of 10.4m and a depth of 3.25m along the boundary with no. 54 and a depth of 4m along the boundary with no. 58, as measured from the existing rear wall.
- A height of 3.6m
- Green roof above

1.3 The existing ground floor extension to be demolished has a width of 6m, a depth of 5m measured from the original rear elevation (towards the boundary with no. 54), a depth of 4m on the opposite side. The extension sits around the middle of the building, surrounding the outrigger.

### 2. Considerations

2.1 The main considerations in relation to the current proposed scheme are:

- Design and Heritage
- Amenity
- Other matters

### 3. Design and heritage

3.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within 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 to be used. Policy D2 states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

3.2 With reference to rear extensions, CPG 1 Design stresses at para 4.10 that they should be designed to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale and proportions, dimensions and detailing; they should 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 ratio of built to unbuilt space; not cause a loss of amenity to adjacent properties with regard to sunlight, daylight, outlook, overshadowing and sense of enclosure; allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden. In addition, it highlights that the width of rear extensions should be designed so that they are not visible from the street and should

respect the rhythm of existing rear extensions.

- 3.3 Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement highlights in the section New Development and work to existing buildings within the conservation area, that the historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area and as such rear extensions and alterations will not be acceptable where they would diverge significantly from the historic pattern.
- 3.4 The group of buildings the application site is part of along the northern side of Dartmouth Park Road, have very similar front elevations, in terms of architectural detailing and features which have been preserved through time.. The row (nos.46 - 66) were evidently built together and their uniform group appearance significantly contributes to the special character of this section of the conservation area (hence their designation as positive contributors). Historic plans from 1915 indicate that the dwellings within this group had originally been built with shallow, central two storey outriggers and, later on, with small ground floor rear extensions added. While it is accepted that the majority of properties within the row have been altered and, in some cases, extended to the rear, their overall coherent appearance has been maintained. Most dwellings within the row still feature predominantly unimpaired roofs (albeit minor additions such as rooflights and small dormers) and their original proportions and rear fenestration remains legible. The majority of buildings within this group have also retained the central outrigger and even where extended, have retained the prominence of this feature. Some of the properties have extended at ground floor level with full width extensions, such as no. 64 which received a granted certificate under application reference number 2006/5662/P on 05/02/2007. The building at no. 60 has a full width rear conservatory, however this is not supported by any planning records.
- 3.5 The application building benefits from a modest rear garden, making the rear of the buildings greatly visible from the opposite properties. Also, Dartmouth Park Road slopes down from east, Dartmouth Park Hill, towards west, Highgate Road, with the application building siting closer to the eastern end where the rear gardens are also getting narrower. The topography of the area would therefore allow greater views from the neighbouring buildings towards the rear garden and extensions to the application building. Due to the close proximity of the buildings within this group and opposite as well as this topography, the rear of the application property is highly prominent in numerous collective private views afforded. Alterations to the rear of the site are therefore sensitive as they would be visible within these views.
- 3.6 The host property has been subject to a number of insensitive and harmful rear alterations and additions through the years which have acted to erode the prominence of its original architectural features, proportions and, in turn, its character. As a result, the existing dwelling sits at odds within the row and currently harms its group character. The application building's rear elevation has been greatly altered through time, with a two storey shallow squared bay which changed the main roof form, and the central outrigger has been partially covered by a significantly larger two storey mono pitched outrigger. The outrigger has been surrounded by a later ground floor extension. The original rear timber sashes have also been replaced with insensitive uPVC windows. There are no records to support the acceptability of these alterations, however they appear to have been in situ for many years.
- 3.7 The historic alterations to the application building have already harmed its character by making it difficult to identify or read its the original form. The proposed full width extension would exacerbate this impact by covering any remaining original elements of the rear elevation. The large areas of glazing proposed to the rear would in no way relate to the host building and would further erode its character. When considering the cumulative impact of the existing and proposed alterations, almost all sense of the original dwelling would be lost as a result of the proposed works. The extension would project at an oblique angle, with a fully glazed rear elevation. Whilst it is identified a mix of rear alterations along

this group, it is considered that the proposed full width extension would further erode the character of the host building, detracting from its original proportions and design. The resulting dwelling would therefore appear even more at odds with the rest of the row, further diverging from the established pattern of historic development.

3.8 The fully glazed rear elevation of the proposed extension, with sliding doors of 3mx3m, appears out of scale with the host building upper floors, losing any element of solidity or reflection of the pattern of window openings at this level. When seen from the rear in relation to the neighbouring buildings, the proposed rear extension does not preserve or enhance the appearance of the host building's rear elevation and character of the wider area. The proposal is considered to result in a rear elevation which diverges significantly from the historic pattern causing harm to the significance of Dartmouth Park Conservation area as a whole.

3.9 It is acknowledged the proposal includes a green roof which would contribute positively to the biodiversity and greenery of the area. It is also acknowledged that the proposed replacement of the insensitive uPVC windows with timber frames sash windows would represent a benefit of the scheme. However, given the aforementioned concerns in relation to the proposed bulk and scale of the extension and cumulative impact upon the dwelling and row, these elements would not be considered outweigh the harm caused by the scheme.

#### **4. Amenity**

4.1 Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that would not harm their amenity. The main factors which are considered to impact the amenity of the neighbouring residents are overlooking, loss of outlook and sense of enclosure, implications on daylight, sunlight and noise.

4.2 Along the boundary with no. 58, the boundary wall extends up to 4m high on a depth of 2m which appears to end in line with the rear line of the extension at no. 58. The proposed extension would project with an additional 2m towards the rear and to a maximum height of 3.6m from the ground level at the application site, and 3m from the neighbouring garden. Considering the existing high boundary wall and the extension at no. 58, it is not considered that the proposed extension would cause a significant harm to the amenity of the occupiers in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

4.3 The building at no. 54 has the rear elevation projecting slightly forward than the application property, and sits at a distance of 2.5m from the application building. In addition, the extension projects on this side by 3.2m, which is considered less likely to cause any significant harm in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.

4.4 The proposed fully glazed rear elevation is considered to cause some levels of light pollution, however this would mainly be facing the rear garden, and therefore it is not considered significantly harmful to represent a reason to refuse the proposed extension.

4.5 Should the development have been otherwise acceptable, a condition would have been applied to prevent the use of the flat roof as an amenity terrace to avoid issues of overlooking.

#### **5. Other matters**

5.1 The applicant justifies the proposed bulk and scale of the rear extension through the fall-back position of permitted development. This 'fall-back' position has not been established via the submission of a lawful development certificate / the implementation of such works. This would not be considered in this instance as the building lies within a conservation area and current scheme is dealt with under a householder planning application which requires a full assessment in terms of impact on the design and character of the area, and compliance

with Camden policies and guidance, as well as NPPF and Local Plan. It is also noted that officer question the assumption that the outlined shown on submitted drawings would remain in accordance with Class A of the GPDO given the alterations from its original form. Limited weight has therefore been afforded to this assumption within the above assessment.

## **6. Recommendation**

### 6.1 Refuse planning permission