

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	03/05/2019
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	29/04/2019
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Kate Henry			2019/1296/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
6 Conybeare London NW3 3SD			Please refer to draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Single storey rooftop extension to provide additional living accommodation; installation of railings on the roof; enlargement of windows facing onto courtyard at rear				
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission		
Application Type:		Householder Application		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 05/04/2019 (consultation expiry date 29/04/2019).</p> <p>1 response has been received, from a nearby occupier at 16 Quickswood (the road to the rear). The comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of keeping with character and appearance of other houses in the estate • Extension would block light to No. 16 Quickswood • Overlooking to No. 16 Quickswood 					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	N/A					

Site Description

6 Conybeare is a detached, two storey, white painted brick residential dwelling with a flat roof on the eastern side of the road. The building is L-shaped and benefits from a private courtyard to the rear, within the L.

The application site is located within a planned residential estate (known as the Chalcot Estate), off King Henry's Road, dating from the 1960's. The majority of the houses on the estate are terraced; however, Nos. 4 and 6 Conybeare are both detached dwellings. No. 6 is surrounded by a grassed area of public open space, which links Conybeare and Quickswood (the road to the east).

The surrounding area is residential in character. The application is not within a Conservation Area and the host building is not listed.

Relevant History

None relevant

24-32 Elliott Square

2017/4239/P - Erection of a roof extension at 3rd floor to 9 terraced houses. **Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement 14/12/2018.**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

London Plan (2016)

Camden Local Plan (2017)

A1 Managing the impact of development

A4 Noise and vibration

D1 Design

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Altering and extending your home (2019)

CPG Design (2019)

CPG Amenity (2018)

Assessment

1. The proposal

1.1. This application seeks planning permission for the following:

- Single storey rooftop extension
- Installation of railings on roof
- Enlargement of windows facing onto courtyard at rear

1.2. The proposed single storey rooftop extension would measure 8 metres by 3.4 metres and would be set back from the front and side building line by 1.2 metres. It would measure 2.9 metres tall.

1.3. The extension would be cladded with vertical painted timber cladding, which would oversail the window openings. The extension would feature 3x openings on its front elevation and 3x openings on its rear elevation. The central opening on the front elevation would provide access to the roof. The extension would also feature a flat rooflight.

1.4. The rooftop extension would provide a gym.

1.5. The proposed railings around the edge of the roof would measure 1.2 metres tall and would be black painted metal. They would not extend around the rear part of the roof.

1.6. The existing ground floor windows facing onto the rear courtyard would be enlarged (width and height) to create two large openings (one on each elevation).

1.7. At first floor, the window to serve the master bedroom would be relocated slightly to the side.

2. Assessment

2.1. The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Design
- Impact on neighbouring properties

3. Design

3.1. Policy D1 of the Local Plan seeks to secure high quality design in development. It notes that the Council will require that development respects local context and character; and comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character.

3.2. All of the buildings on Conybeare are two storeys tall and so are the dwellings on the two parallel roads (Quickswood). Whilst there are some taller (4 storey) buildings on the estate, these are of a different style and are all located on the road that runs perpendicular to Conybeare (also Quickswood), parallel to Adelaide Road.

3.3. The proposed roof top extension would be at odds with the surrounding pattern of development and it is considered that the resultant building would detract from the character and appearance of the streetscene along Conybeare.

3.4. It is recognised that No. 6 stands alone in the street, rather than forming part of a terrace; however, its roofline corresponds with its neighbours and there is a strong horizontal emphasis

as one looks down the street, which is created by the flat roofs and parapets of the existing buildings. Although the proposed extension would be set back from the building edge by 1.2 metres, given its size and height (8 metres by 3.4 metres and 2.9 metres tall), it would represent a significant addition to the host building and it would be visible in long-range views of the building, along Conybeare and from Quickswood.

- 3.5. The proposed vertical timber cladding would also be at odds with the host building and the neighbouring buildings. Brick is the main building material in the estate and although the nearby buildings feature some timber cladding on their elevations, the cladding is horizontally placed and represents a subservient feature (i.e. it is in small amounts overall). It is considered that the vertical timber cladding would detract from the horizontal emphasis of the host building, and the proposed extension would appear too visually distinct from the original building, thereby making it overly prominent. Furthermore, the proposal to clad the entire rooftop extension in timber cladding would mean that timber cladding was no longer a subservient/secondary building material.
- 3.6. It is worth noting that planning permission has been granted for a roof extension to 9 terraced properties on Elliot Square (to the west of the application site and part of the wider Chalcot Estate) (application reference 2017/4239/P). However, that case was different insofar as it related to 9 terraced buildings and the terrace in question faced onto King Henry's Road and therefore shares a relationship with the properties on the other side of King Henry's Road, as well as those in the estate.
- 3.7. The proposed railings around the roof edge would also detract from the character and appearance of the wider area. It is recognised that the railings would be painted white and would match railings on the taller buildings on Quickswood (to the north of the application site); however, none of the immediate neighbouring buildings feature railings at roof level and the proposed railings would detract from the strong horizontal emphasis in the street scene, which is created by the rooflines and parapets of the buildings.
- 3.8. The proposed changes to the windows at the rear of the property would not be visible in the street scene along Conybeare and although the proposed changes might be glimpsed from the area of public open space to the rear of the building, it is not considered that the changes would cause undue harm to the character and appearance of the wider area.
- 3.9. The application is recommended for refusal based on the harm that would be caused by the rooftop extension and the railings.

4. Impact on neighbouring properties

- 4.1. Policy A1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development which does not cause unacceptable harm to amenity. The factors to consider include visual privacy and outlook; sunlight, daylight and overshadowing; artificial lighting levels; noise and vibration; and impacts of the construction phase.
- 4.2. Given that No. 6 stands alone in the street, this mitigates the impact on neighbouring properties to a certain extent. It is not considered that the proposed extension would lead to any harmful loss of sunlight or daylight to neighbouring properties. Although No. 16 Quickswood is located to the north, the buildings are separated by approximately 10 metres and when the sun is to the south, it will be at its highest point in the sky, which means the proposed extension is unlikely to cast a shadow over No. 16. There are no properties directly to the east or west of the host building.
- 4.3. It is not considered that the proposed extension would cause any harmful loss of privacy. The proposed openings are located on the front and rear (not directly facing any other properties) and the openings would be oversailed by the timber cladding, which would limit views

outwards. If the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, a planning condition could ensure that no further openings were formed in the side elevations of the extension, in order to prevent direct overlooking towards No. 7 Conybeare and No. 16 Quickswood.

- 4.4. It is not considered that the proposed extension would affect the outlook of neighbouring properties, due to the separation distance between the neighbouring buildings and the host building.
- 4.5. It is not considered that the proposed extension would give rise to noise and vibration problems, especially given that the host building is detached.
- 4.6. It is not considered that the proposed changes to the windows would impact on neighbouring buildings. This is because the enlarged openings would be at ground level and the relocated bathroom window would still be obscurely-glazed.
- 4.7. It is not considered that the railings would impact harmfully on neighbouring properties; however, if the roof was used as a terrace, this might lead to overlooking into neighbouring properties and their private courtyards. If the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, a suitable planning condition could ensure that the roof was not used for amenity purposes and was only accessed for maintenance purposes.
- 4.8. If the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable it is not considered that undue harm would be caused as a result of the construction process. This is due to the scale and nature of the proposed works.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.