

ppmPlanning

185 Casewick Road
London
SE27 0TA

Mark Pender
Director



APPEAL STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT

Nigel Geffen

Flat B, 45 Fordwych Road, NW2 3TN

CONTENTS

1.0 Background

2.0 Reason for Refusal

3.0 Conclusion

1.0 Background

1.1 In April 2018, a planning application for the erection of an upper ground floor rear extension and installation of replacement rear facing window was submitted to the Council. The application was registered as valid on the 16th May 2018 and referenced 2018/2018/P.

1.2 Planning permission was refused on the 18th July 2018 under delegated power for the following reason:

The proposed rear extension, by reason of its siting at first floor level, cumulative bulk, scale and mass in conjunction with the existing ground floor and first floor extensions and detailed design would be detrimental to the appearance of the host building and surrounding area. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan (2017) and Policy 2 of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (2015).

1.3 Section 2 of this report will assess the proposal against the reason for refusal.

2.0 Reason for Refusal

2.1 The officer's delegated report sets out the Council's detailed concerns which I summarise as follows:

- Scale, bulk and design obscure the original rear elevation and harm the character and appearance of it.
- Full width extension would be an alien feature.
- Previous extensions compound overall harm.
- Proposed fenestration is unacceptable.

2.2 I will now go through each of the above concerns.

Scale, bulk and design obscure the original rear elevation and harm the character and appearance of it.

2.3 The original building has been considerably extended at lower and upper ground levels. The first floor has also been considerably altered with the introduction of a terrace with parapet walls and railings and French doors. The existing upper ground floor fenestration (kitchen window and patio doors) is poor thus detracting from the character and appearance of the host building.

2.4 The proposed extension is approximately 1.75metres deep and 2.7metres wide and will sit behind railings which already exist. In effect, the existing rear wall will be brought forward by 1.75metres.

2.5 The proposal is modest in scale and bulk and will introduce improved fenestration, the finer details of which can be conditioned so they match as far as possible the existing fenestration on the first and second floors.

- 2.6 Given the host building has already been significantly altered and taking account of the scale of the proposal and the design including the fenestration, I do not consider the proposal will harm the appearance of the rear elevation. In fact, the proposal will enhance it.

Full width extension would be an alien feature.

- 2.7 It could be argued that the existing rear elevation already comprises *alien* features albeit those features benefit from planning permission as set out in the officer's delegated report. Having said this, there are many varying examples in the terrace of rear extensions.

- 2.8 Clearly the proposed extension will result in a full width extension on the upper ground level taking account of the existing extension at this level. This is no different to the lower ground floor. Merely because the proposal results in a full width extension, does not make it inappropriate and unacceptable. In this respect, there are no amenity issues as acknowledged in the officer's delegated report. With regard to the design, as I have stated above the appearance of the rear of the host building will in my view be improved.

Previous extensions compound overall harm.

- 2.9 The officer's report appears to suggest that previous extensions cause harm to the host building and that this proposal will compound that harm. Clearly this is not the case as the existing extensions all benefit from planning permission as set out in the officer's delegated report.

- 2.10 In my view there is no harm in terms of residential amenity and there is no harm in terms of design. The proposal is extremely modest in scale and will improve the internal configuration of the flat by making the lounge/kitchen more open plan.

Proposed fenestration is unacceptable.

- 2.11 The delegated report states:

The proposed rear fenestration is also considered to be inappropriate for the upper ground floor level of this unit. The level of glazing proposed would overwhelm the rear elevation, with a large area of 'voids' at this upper floor level. This serves to reduce the legibility of the building, and gives the rear additions a bulky appearance. For these reasons the fenestration proposed is considered to be unacceptable.

- 2.12 It is proposed to replace both the kitchen window and the patio doors. The existing kitchen window is incongruous and will be replaced with a window that is more akin to the proportions of the windows above. The new patio doors extend the full width of the proposed extension and will comprise mainly glazing. This will give a contemporary feel to the building, 'lightening' the façade and at the same time create a wonderful and extremely well-lit internal space.

2.13 As I have already said, the fenestration detailing can be conditioned to ensure it matches as far as possible the existing fenestration on the first and second floors. This will improve the coherence of the rear elevation.

3.0 Conclusion

3.1 We have demonstrated that the issues raised in the reason for refusal are not sustainable and therefore respectfully request the appeal is allowed.