

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	14/01/2020
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	11/01/2020
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Ben Farrant			2019/5832/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
19 Fairfax Place London NW6 4EJ			See draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of first floor side extension to facilitate a lift shaft.				
Recommendation(s):	Refused			
Application Type:	Householder			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refuse Permission			
Informatives:				
Consultations				
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed between 18/12/2019 and 11/01/2020.</p> <p>Objections from three addresses were received, summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every sympathy for the requirements of the occupant, but concerned about visual changes adversely affecting the streetscape and character of Fairfax Place. • The mews is an unusually well-preserved piece of mid-century planning with harmony, symmetry and consistency in its original design • The proposal would serve to destroy the appearance and uniformity of the mews where orderliness and neatness are at the heart of its charm • The addition would unbalance the terrace • The house is particularly conspicuous at the entrance to the road; the extension would be highly visible • Would set a precedent for extensions • Could an internal stair-lift be installed instead? 			

Site Description

The property is an end of terrace, two storey brick built property, in a street of similar mews style properties along Fairfax Place. Due to the siting of the property and adjacent garages, the side elevation is entirely publically visible from the street.

The property is not located within a conservation area nor are there any nearby statutorily Listed Buildings which would be affected as a result of the works.

Relevant History

19 Fairfax Place (application site):

2018/6082/P - Proposed first floor side extension to facilitate a lift shaft - **Refused 13/03/2019**, for the following reason:

1. The proposed side extension, by reason of its scale, siting and visibility within the streetscene would be harmful to the composition, character and appearance of the host building and uniform appearance of the terrace. As such the proposal is contrary to policy D1 (Design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).

2007/6383/P – Erection of single-storey rear ground floor level extension to the existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3) – **Granted 13/02/2008**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2019

The London Plan March 2016

The Draft New London Plan 2019

The Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 - Managing the impact of development

D1 - Design

C6 - Access for all

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Access (2019)

CPG Altering and extending your home (2019)

CPG Amenity (2018)

CPG Design (2019)

Assessment

1.0. Proposal

- 1.1. Proposed is the formation of a first floor side extension above the existing ground floor link to the garage. The addition would have a depth of 1.9m and width of 1.35m, with a flat roof finishing just below the eaves of the main property. By reason of the siting of the property, the proposed change would be entirely publically visible from Fairfax Place.
- 1.2. This is a resubmission of the previously refused application ref: 2018/6082/P dated 13/03/2019; there are two differences between the previous scheme and that proposed here:
 - 1) Alteration to the roof, from a hipped roof (tiled to match existing) previously refused, to a flat roof proposed here;
 - 2) Timber clad finish to the external walls of this proposal (rather than matching brickwork previously refused).

2.0. Assessment

Design

- 2.1. Paragraph 3.3 of CPG Altering and extending your home 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*"
- 2.2. In this instance it is proposed to extend to the full height of the eaves of the host property and would project higher than existing extensions within the area, contrary to this policy.
- 2.3. It is noted that the street is characterised by its uniform appearance, and the side elevation of the property is particularly prominent given the single storey nature of the adjacent garages providing a 'break' in the terraces at this point in the street. Given the overall height of the addition, coupled with its nature within this otherwise infilled area at first floor level, the proposed development would form an uncharacteristic and unduly prominent addition to the streetscene. The addition, by reason of its siting and prominence, would unduly harm the composition, character and appearance of the property, adjoining terrace, and surrounding area. The material finish chosen is also of concern, serving to further increase the prominence of this projecting element, forming an incongruous feature at the end of this terrace of properties and in this important gap within the streetscene. This is considered to cause harm to the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area.
- 2.4. Policy C6 expects buildings to meet the highest **practicable** standards of accessible and inclusive design. The need to create an accessible and inclusive home needs to be balanced against other policies of the development plan. The Equality Act 2010 provides protection from discrimination in respect of certain protected characteristics, namely: age, disability, gender reassignment, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or beliefs and sex and sexual orientation. The Duty requires due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. Having due regard to the Public Sector Equality Duty, it is recognised that the refusal of the current application would have greater impact on the applicant who is elderly and disabled, two protected characteristics, than would otherwise be the case. However the benefits in terms of the Duty would only extend to the current and any future mobility impaired occupiers and would a wider benefit.
- 2.5. With this in mind, it is still considered that there are alternative internal measures which could be undertaken to provide the same level of step-free access within the property without causing harm to the appearance of the building as outlined above. The harm caused

to the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area as a result of the addition is permanent and has a wider impact which is considered to warrant the refusal of the application in this instance, and would not be outweighed by the equality impact.

Amenity

- 2.6. The siting, scale and design of the proposed addition is such that, it is considered not to result in harm to the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

- 2.7 Given the above, the proposal is considered contrary to advice contained within CPG Altering and extending your home (2019), Policy D1 of the Local Plan (2017), and Section 12 of the NPPF (2019).

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1 Refuse planning permission.