

|   |  |                       |  |                   |
|---|--|-----------------------|--|-------------------|
| <b>Delegated Report</b>   |  | <b>Analysis sheet</b> | <b>Expiry Date:</b>                    | <b>29/11/2019</b> |
|   |  | N/A / attached        | <b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>       | <b>11/11/2019</b> |
| <b>Officer</b>  |  |                       | <b>Application Number(s)</b>           |                   |
| Kate Henry  |  |                       | 1) 2019/5108/P<br>2) 2019/5109/P       |                   |
| <b>Application Address</b>  |  |                       | <b>Drawing Numbers</b>                 |                   |
| 6 Conybeare<br>London<br>NW3 3SD  |  |                       | Please refer to draft decision notices |                   |
| <b>PO 3/4</b>   | <b>Area Team Signature</b>                                     | <b>C&amp;UD</b>       | <b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>    |                   |
|   |  |                       |  |                   |
| <b>Proposal(s)</b>  |  |                       |  |                   |
| 1) Single storey roof extension to rear part of building; installation of raised parapet wall to front of building; alterations to fenestration<br>2) Single storey roof extension to middle part of building; installation of raised parapet wall to front and rear of building; alterations to fenestration |  |                       |  |                   |
| <b>Recommendation(s):</b>   | 1) Refuse planning permission<br>2) Refuse planning permission |                       |  |                   |
| <b>Application Types:</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>               | No. notified   | <b>00</b> | No. of responses | <b>00</b> | No. of objections | <b>00</b> |
| <b>Summary of consultation responses:</b> | <p>For both applications site notices were displayed on 18/10/2019 (consultation expiry date 11/11/2019)</p> <p>No responses have been received.</p>   |           |                  |           |                   |           |
| <b>Quickswood Resident's Association</b>  | <p><b>1) 2019/5109/P</b></p> <p>Quickswood Residents' Association ('the QRA') is a long established voluntary body elected annually by residents of the sector of the Chalcots Estate in which the property is located. The sector comprises 66 properties.</p> <p>The QRA has various responsibilities in relation to the maintenance and running of the sector, including advising the landlord, Chalcots Estate Limited ("CEL"), on all applications to make external alterations to properties in the sector. All properties in the sector are required by a Scheme of Management to obtain the permission of CEL before making such alterations. The proposal which is the subject of this application therefore requires the permission of CEL before it can proceed.</p> <p>In considering any application for permission to make alterations the QRA takes into consideration (a) the impact of any alteration on the architectural integrity of the sector as a whole; (b) any potential detriment, or benefit, to other residents of the sector arising from the alteration, including any potential interference with privacy, and any impact upon the light entering into other properties and the views those properties enjoy; and (c) the potential that any alteration may set a precedent, with future adverse effects for residents arising from the pressure to allow the same or similar alterations to other properties.</p> <p>The QRA objects to the proposals for the addition of an extra storey as proposed. This is because:</p> <p>(a) The Quickswood sector was designed as a low rise estate, with two storey houses, including 6 Conybeare, in the central, southern and western areas, three storey houses in the terrace bordering the east of the sector, and four storey houses bordering the north of the sector. This architectural assembly, and in particular the relationship between, and arrangement of, two, three and four storey houses, is a crucially important feature of the overall design of the sector. There are no houses with more than two storeys in the central / western part of the sector, where 6 Conybeare is situated.</p> |           |                  |           |                   |           |

(b) The QRA is concerned to preserve and maintain the architectural integrity and harmony of the sector as a whole. Any upwards extension of properties on the sector by the addition of extra storeys would seriously compromise that integrity and harmony. For this reason permission has never been granted for the addition of extra storeys onto houses in the sector.

(b) The proposed addition of an additional storey onto 6 Conybeare would make it significantly taller than the immediately neighbouring properties, and would therefore adversely affect the appearance of that part of the sector as a whole, and in particular the street scene.

(c) The additional storey would cast a shadow onto the neighbouring communal garden, adversely affecting the light enjoyed by residents using that garden. The garden is a communal resource which is available to be enjoyed by all residents of the sector. It may also cast a shadow onto neighbouring properties and intrude on their privacy, although we have not been able at this stage to assess the extent of any such impacts, in part because it is not clear from your plans exactly what sight lines there will be from the proposed new storey, so have not taken them into account in reaching this decision.

(d) Granting permission for the addition of an extra storey would create a precedent, which would inevitably lead to requests from other residents for permission to make the same change. If permission were granted for 6 Conybeare, it may be difficult to justify refusal of permission on other properties. The result is likely to be, or could be, a general increase in the height of houses on the sector, with development occurring in a haphazard and uneven way. The QRA considers this to be highly undesirable for a variety of reasons, including the impact on the amount of light in the communal gardens, the architectural harmony of the estate, and the detriment caused to other properties by blocking light and intruding on privacy.

It should be noted that a similar proposal was made by the owners of 6 Conybeare to add an additional storey to the property earlier in 2019. The permission of CEL was sought for this change and was refused. The QRA considers it highly likely that CEL will refuse this application too.

## 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 Quickwood (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

### 6 Conybeare

**2019/2775/P:** Erection of two-storey rear extension, associated alterations to fenestration. **Granted 08/08/2019.**

**2019/2776/P:** Certificate of lawfulness - i) Insertion of new window; ii) Insertion of 5x rooflights; iii) Erection of roof railings and iv) Replacement garden fence. **Part granted / part refused 07/08/2019.**

Granted permission for (i) the insertion of new window, (ii) the insertion of 5x rooflights; and (iv) replacement garden fence.

Refused permission for (iii) the erection of railings

Reasons for refusal:

- 1. The proposed roof railings are not permitted under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 1, Class C.1(b) as the alteration would protrude more than 0.15 metres beyond the plane of the slope of the original roof when measured from the perpendicular with the external surface of the original roof.*
- 2. The proposed roof railings are not permitted under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 1, Class C.1(c) as the alteration would result in the highest part of the alteration being higher than the highest part of the original roof.*
- 3. The proposed roof railings are not permitted under The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A.1(k) as the proposal would include the provision of a roof terrace.*

**2019/1296/P:** Single storey rooftop extension to provide additional living accommodation; installation of railings on the roof; enlargement of windows facing onto courtyard at rear. **Refused 31/05/2019.**

Reasons for refusal:

- 1. The proposed rooftop extension, by reason of its siting, size, material and detailed design, would appear as an overbearing and incongruous addition to the host building, and would thereby detract from the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area, contrary to the aims of Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan.*
- 2. The proposed railings, by reason of their siting, height and appearance, would appear as a visually intrusive addition to the host building, and would thereby detract from the character and appearance of the host building and the wider area, contrary to the aims of Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan.*

## **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) and Draft London Plan (2019)**

**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 proposals**

- 1.1. Two planning applications have been submitted simultaneously for broadly similar proposals.
- 1.2. Application reference **2019/5108/P** seeks permission for a single storey roof extension to the rear part of the building; the installation of a raised parapet wall to the front of the building and alterations to fenestration.
- 1.3. Application reference **2019/5109/P** seeks permission for a single storey roof extension to the middle part of the building; the installation of a raised parapet wall to the front and rear of the building and alterations to fenestration.

#### **2019/5108/P**

- 1.4. The proposed roof extension would sit above the whole of the rear (eastern) part of the L-shaped building and part of the front (western) part of the building. The rear part of the extension would extend upwards in line with the existing building edges and the part of the extension which houses the staircase (the front / western part) would be set in from the side (northern) building edge by 0.5 metres.
- 1.5. The proposed extension would measure between 3.6 and 5.9 metres wide (side to side) and between 7.3 and 10.3 metres long (front to back). It would measure 2.5 metres tall above the existing parapet.
- 1.6. The majority of the extension would be constructed with painted brickwork to match the existing building. The staircase element would be clad with horizontal timber cladding to match existing timber cladding on the front elevation of the host building.
- 1.7. The rooftop extension would provide a gym, a bathroom and study. An external courtyard would also be provided between the gym and study.
- 1.8. A raised parapet to the front elevation is also proposed, to match the existing parapets on the side elevations of the host building.
- 1.9. Changes to the fenestration on the elevations facing the private yard are proposed (altering

size of openings at ground floor and altering the position of a window at first floor) These changes have also been approved pursuant to planning application reference 2019/2775/P.

### **2019/5109/P**

- 1.10. The proposed roof extension would sit above part of the rear (eastern) part of the L-shaped building and part of the front (western) part of the building.
- 1.11. The extension would measure 4 metres wide (side to side) and 8.2 metres long (front to back). It would be set in from the side (northern) edge of the host building by 0.4 metres.
- 1.12. The extension would be constructed with channel glass rainscreen cladding in front of an opaque (sandblasted / white finished) wall.
- 1.13. The rooftop extension would provide a gym and bathroom.
- 1.14. Raised parapets to the front and rear elevations are also proposed, to match the existing parapets on the side elevations of the host building.
- 1.15. Changes to the fenestration on the elevations facing the private yard are proposed (altering size of openings at ground floor and altering the position of a window at first floor) These changes have also been approved pursuant to planning application reference 2019/2775/P.

## **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. As noted at the time of the previously refused application (reference 2019/1296/P), all of the buildings on Conybeare are two storeys tall and so are those on the two parallel roads (Quickwood). 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 Quickwood), parallel to Adelaide Road.
- 3.3. The proposed roof top extensions 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, and also the wider estate. This is despite the fact that the extensions would be set back from the front (western) elevation. This is because the application building is visible in long-range views along the street.
- 3.4. As noted at the time of the previous application, 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 of the existing buildings. The proposed extensions would represent a significant addition to the host building at a highly prominent level of the building and would be visible in long-range views of the building, along Conybeare and from Quickwood.

- 3.5. The proposed materials for application reference 2019/5109/P are also considered to be inappropriate. The proposed channel glass in front of a white wall would detract from the character and appearance of the host building and all the other buildings in this part of the estate. Channel glass is not seen elsewhere on the estate and the proposal to clad the entire rooftop extension with this material would draw further attention to the inappropriate rooftop addition. Whilst it is sometimes appropriate to use a contrasting material, in order to distinguish between new and old parts of a building, in this case the extension itself is not considered to be acceptable and even if the extension was considered to be acceptable in principle, the use of this type of material at rooftop level would not be supported.
- 3.6. The use of matching brick and horizontal timber cladding proposed as part of planning application reference 2019/5108/P are considered to be acceptable, notwithstanding the fact that the principle of development is not supported.
- 3.7. The proposals also seek to provide parapets to the front elevation (and the rear elevation in the case of application reference 2019/5109/P) to match the existing parapets on the side elevations of the host building. None of the other buildings on Conybeare have a front parapet wall and this is a key feature of the streetscene and the lack of a front parapet wall serves to strengthen the horizontal emphasis of the streetscene. The proposal to add a front parapet to the application building would detract from the established pattern of rooflines in the streetscene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area. On this basis, the proposal to add the front parapet is not supported. The proposal to add a parapet at the rear would not have the same detrimental impact and is therefore considered to be acceptable.
- 3.8. The changes to the fenestration are considered to be acceptable on the basis the changes affect the least visible elevations of the property (i.e. those elevations which face the private yard) and these changes have already been granted permission, pursuant to planning permission reference 2019/2775/P.
- 3.9. To conclude this section, the proposed rooftop extensions and front parapet walls would detract from the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the wider area and would fail to respect local context and character, contrary to the aims of Policy D1 of the Local Plan. The applications are both recommended for refusal on this basis.

#### **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. As highlighted at the time of the previous planning application, the fact that No. 6 stands along in the street 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 extensions would cause any harmful loss of privacy. The rooftop extension proposed as part of planning application 2019/5108/P does not have any openings. The rooftop extension proposed as part of planning application 2019/5109/P has inward opening windows on the front and rear elevation; however, the openings would be oversailed by the channel glass which would limit views outwards. If either of the applications 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. 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
- 4.7. The proposals are both considered to be acceptable in this respect.

**Recommendations:**

2019/5108/P – Refuse planning permission.

2019/5109/P – Refuse planning permission.