

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	05/11/2019
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	02/11/2019
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Sofie Fieldsend			2019/4586/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
7 Lower Merton Rise London NW3 3RA			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 two storey front extension and rear fenestration alterations					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on the 09/10/2019 and the consultation period expired on the 02/11/2019.</p> <p>One objection was received from Trust Property Management (act as managing agents on behalf of Chalcot Estates Limited).</p> <p>Their objection can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>7 Lower Merton Rise is subject to a High Court approved Scheme of Management CEL is the Scheme Manager. The making of the planning application by the applicant is in breach of the Scheme of Management as the applicant has not previously obtained the consent of the Scheme Manager to the proposals. Having now seen the proposals, CEL has declined to consent as the proposals are in breach of its guidelines.</p> <p><i>Officer response:</i> <i>This is not a material planning consideration but a civil matter</i></p>					

## Site Description

The site is three storey mid terrace property and is located along the Western side of Lower Merton Rise. This property and its adjoining neighbour at no.5 are set back slightly from the front building line of No.9 Lower Merton Rise.

The building is not listed or located within a Conservation Area. It does form part of the Chalcot Estate.

## Relevant History

### Application site

**2012/2525/P** - Erection of enlarged front porch to single dwelling (Class C3). - **Granted 02/07/2012**

**2008/2993/P** - Erection of an additional storey to single family dwelling house (C3).- **Granted 18/09/2008**

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

### London Plan (2016)

### Draft London Plan (2017)

### Camden's Local Plan (2017)

- Policy A1 – Managing the impact of development
- Policy D1 – Design

### Supplementary Guidance

- CPG Altering and extending your home (2019)
  - Chapters 1, 2, 4
- CPG Design (2019)
- CPG Amenity (2018)

## Assessment

### Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for:

- Erection of two storey front extension at ground and first floor measuring 2m deep, 6.7m wide and 6m high.
- Rear fenestration alterations involving replacement of existing upvc double patio doors with narrower upvc patio doors.

1.2 It is noted on the site location plan that No.9 Lower Merton Rise is incorrectly labelled as No.6.

### 2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Design and Appearance
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

### 3.0 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 Planning Guidance (CPG Altering and extending your home) states that "design should positively enhance the character of existing buildings on site and other building immediately adjacent and in the surrounding area".

4.2 Camden's Design Guidance indicates that proposals should have regard to the scale, form and massing of neighbouring buildings and respect and preserve the historic pattern where it exists.

4.3 It is noted that the adjoining property at No.5 is the mirror image of the application site and maintains the same set back front building line. The front fenestration of both properties remain largely unaltered. Although the application site has been subject to a front porch.

4.4 The proposal will add 13.4sqm to each floor. It will create a utility room and an enlarged lobby with WC at ground floor and enlarge the existing bedroom and bathroom at first floor. The existing 5 bedroom property is not considered to be substandard in size.

4.5 The proposed front extension will extend 2m forward to match the front building line of No.9, this property is not part of a matching pair and has a larger footprint than the adjoining identical pair at No's. 5 and 7. It is considered that the front extension would erode this historic set back and its uniformity with No.5. It is not in keeping with the pattern of development within the terrace and would compromise the established front building line. It would not be a subordinate addition in relation to the host property and it is considered that its scale and massing is excessive. An extension in this location would appear as a prominent and bulky addition which detracts from the character and appearance of the host property, terrace and the wider Chalcot Estate.

4.6 Although the extension will be built in materials to match the existing. The proposed new entrance and window will swap locations and the application site will no longer appear as a mirror image to its adjoining neighbour at No.5 which both have central front entrances with larger windows on either

side. It is considered the detailed design of the proposed front fenestration would harm this pair's relatively uniform appearance.

4.7 On the rear the existing patio doors at ground floor will be replaced with narrower upvc doors to match the existing. It is mostly screen by a 1.6m rear timber fence. This replacement and reduction in the scale of the doors is not considered to harm the character and appearance of the rear elevation.

4.8 UPVC is normally not supported as outlined in CPG Design which states that this material has a 'harmful aesthetic impact and an inability to biodegrade and therefore is strongly discouraged', however in this instance this is the existing building material for this terrace and it would be unreasonable in this instance to include it as a reason for refusal.

## **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.

5.2 The front extension will not project further than No.6's front building line and it is significantly set away from No.5. The rear fenestration in terms of its siting and scale is considered to be minor alterations. The development is not considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenity of either neighbouring property in terms of loss light, privacy, overlooking or a sense of enclosure.

## **6.0 Conclusion**

6.1 Overall it is considered that the proposed two storey front extension by reason of its siting, excessive scale, depth, width, height and detailed design fails to be subordinate to the existing dwelling and respect the existing front building line. The front extension is therefore considered to be a detriment to the character and appearance of the existing building, terrace, the street scene and the locality, contrary to policy D1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

## **7.0 Recommendation**

7.1 Refuse planning permission.