

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		15/11/2018	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		19/11/2018	
Officer				Application Numbers			
Samir Benmbarek				2018/4530/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
104 Drummond Street London NW1 2HN				See Decision Notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of three storey rear extension with second floor roof terrace and associated alterations to residential building.							
Recommendation:		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	--	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		Site notices were displayed in close proximity to the site on 26/10/2018 (expiring on 19/11/2018). To date, no responses have been received on the application.					
CAAC/ National Amenity Society comments:		N/A.					

Site Description

The application relates to a four-storey building, comprising lower ground, ground and two upper floors, located on the northern side of Drummond Street. The property is not located within a conservation area, nor is it a listed building. The fourth storey (second floor level) of the building is of a mansard style design with a valley roof clad in natural slate.

The building is in use as residential (Use C3) with the building separated into 2 x self-contained flats.

Relevant History

No relevant planning application history.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework, 2012

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)

CPG Amenity (March 2018)

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a three-storey rear extension with a rear amenity terrace at second floor level and the alteration to the main roof level.

1.2 The proposed rear extension would be increased to a height of 8.2m from the existing lower ground level (garden) and would extend 1.8m from the rear elevation of the building and be at full width. The extension would be constructed from stock brick with white render to match the existing rear elevation. The windows and doors would be timber framed sash windows and glazed doors at lower ground and ground floor level. The proposal also includes the introduction of an increased parapet level upright, at rear second floor level that would match that of No.106 with and terrace and balustrading above.

1.3 As a result, the proposal would provide an additional 9sqm to the existing lower ground floor studio flat and an additional 12sqm to the existing maisonette, altering it from a two-bedroom to a three-bedroom unit. The proposed terrace at second floor level would measure at 12.4sqm and serve this unit.

1.4 The main issues for consideration are:

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

2. Assessment of Impact on Host Building and Surrounding Area

2.1 Along the northern side of Drummond Street, the host building forms part of a terrace of four buildings to the east of Exmouth Mews. At the rear of this terrace, No. 108 Drummond Street has been extended and altered, while the remaining three buildings remain largely intact at the rear. No. 102 and 104 Drummond Street features a mansard-style valley roof with natural slate at second floor level. At No. 106, the rear wall has been built upwards to form a parapet wall with the roof form altered. This alteration has likely taken place within the last 10 years without the benefit of planning; as a result this form of unauthorised development (which would become lawful by virtue of the passage of time in 4 years) would not guide this application.

2.2 The Council's design policies 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.

2.3 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;
- Respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;
- Respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks;
- Respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt landscape

2.4 Accompanying these general principles, paragraph 4.13 of CPG1 states "*extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height*

of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged”.

- 2.5 The eaves of this property is considered to be located at the top of the first floor level (distinct line changing from brick to slate) and not the top of the valley roof. The rear extension proposed would terminate at the existing eaves level and therefore not a full storey beneath eaves level, this combined with it being full-width mean it is read as neither secondary nor subordinate to the building being extended. Therefore, the rear extension is contrary to policy D1 of the Local Plan.
- 2.6 The rear of the existing second floor level has been designed with a raised wall that obscures the valley roof to match that of No. 106. The wall would obscure the roof detailing of the second floor and in conjunction with the bulky extension below, would further erode the character and form of the building. This element of the proposal does not ‘*respect local context and character*’ or ‘*comprise details that are of high quality and complement the local character*’ that policy D1 expects developments to do. It is important to note this roof valley roof form is also present on No. 102 Drummond Street. Although this detail has since been lost at No.106, again, this alteration has likely taken place within the last 10 years without the benefit of planning (noting that it would become lawful by virtue of the passage of time in 4 years) and will not therefore guide future development within this terrace.
- 2.7 The proposed rear extension and increased parapet wall at second floor level, which obscures the valley roof, is considered to be of detriment to the design and form of the host building and erode the character of this building and further erode the rear of the terrace in combination with the rear raised wall at No. 106.
- 2.8 The proposed balustrading in association with the creation of the second floor terrace is considered appropriate in terms of its design and the principle of it being at a high level. However, as the rear extension that the terrace sits upon is unacceptable it could not in fact be delivered. The proposed door at second floor level to create the means of access is considered to be an inappropriate alteration at roof level and the proposed privacy screening is also considered to create unacceptable clutter at high level.

3. Amenity

- 3.1 Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbouring properties is protected. It states that planning permission will not be granted for development that causes harm to the amenity of occupiers and neighbours in terms of loss of daylight, sunlight, outlook and privacy.
- 3.2 Due to the modest depth of the rear extension, it is considered that the extension would not lead to an adverse loss of light or outlook to adjoining residential occupiers. The extension, by virtue of its close position, does effect the outlook from the windows of No. 106, but these are not habitable and serve a staircase. The proposed windows of the extension would look not cause unacceptable overlooking as there are already established views to the rear and the flank wall of the adjoining building. The proposal would not lead to new or harmful levels of overlooking.
- 3.3 The proposed amenity terrace is considered to not adversely affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The western side would have a 1.8m privacy screening (which has been discussed previously on design), while on the eastern side, views back along the terrace of buildings are obscured by the neighbouring chimney stack. The views from the amenity terrace would look into already established views, typical of rear residential locations.

4. Recommendation

Refuse Planning Permission.