

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	22/07/2020
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	22/06/2020
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Sofie Fieldsend			2020/2122/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
113 Queen's Crescent London NW5 4EY			See decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of a 2 storey rear extension at basement/ ground floor following demolition of existing and erection of rear balcony at ground floor. Erection of a roof extension and terrace. Replacement of front basement window with doors. Extension to front boundary pillars and installation of front boundary railings. Rear landscaping alterations and level changes.				
Recommendation:	Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:	Householder Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00	No. of comments	00
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed on the 29/05/2020 and the consultation period expired on the 22/06/2020. No responses were received.					
Community groups	No response from any community group was received.					

Site Description

The site is three-storey plus basement and end terrace building located on the west side of Queen's Crescent. The rear of the building and terrace is visible from Herbert Street. The site is not listed or located within a Conservation Area.

Relevant History

Application site

2020/2387/P - Erection of a 2 storey rear extension at basement/ ground floor following demolition of existing and erection of rear balcony at ground floor. Erection of a roof extension and terrace. Replacement of front basement window with doors. Extension to front boundary pillars and installation of front boundary railings. Rear landscaping alterations and level changes. – **Pending decision**

Other properties within the terrace

101

2015/3722/P - Mansard roof extension to mid-terraced house including: dormer window to front, terrace to rear and new balcony and French doors to replace first floor level rear window. **Granted 12/08/2015**

105

TP/227/30535 – three storey extension at basement, ground and first floor levels - **Granted 1965**

2018/5233/P - Conversion from 2 self-contained flats into single family dwellinghouse, including demolition and rebuild of the existing rear two-storey extension, to include terrace at second floor level and new steps into the rear garden, replacement of windows at roof level. – **Granted 26/02/2019**

107

2012/0892/P - Erection of mansard roof extension including a dormer window to the front elevation, glazed sliding doors and roof terrace to the rear elevation and installation of 3 x rooflights to residential flat (Class C3). **Granted 18/04/2012**

111

2012/5958/P - Erection of mansard roof with rear terrace area as an extension to the existing house (Class C3). – **Granted 21/12/2012 (Not implemented)**

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

London Plan (2016)

London Plan intend to publish (2019)

Camden's Local Plan (2017)

A1 – Managing the impact of development

D1 – Design

Supplementary Guidance

CPG Altering and extending your home (2019)

- Chapters 1, 2, 4

CPG Design

CPG Amenity (2018)

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the following:

- Erection of a 2 storey rear extension at basement/ ground floor following demolition of existing and erection of rear balcony at ground floor measuring 0.9m deep by 4.1m wide.
- Erection of a roof extension and terrace.
- Replacement of front basement window with doors.
- Replacement of existing windows with timber double glazed windows
- Extension to front boundary pillars and installation of front boundary railings.
- Rear landscaping alterations and level changes.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- The visual impact upon the character and appearance of the host property and streetscene
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers

3.0 Design and Appearance

Policy background

3.1 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's design policies are supported by Camden Planning Guidance Design. Camden Planning Guidance document CPG Altering and Extending your home advises that extensions should be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and proportion.

3.2 CPG Altering and extending your home outlines that mansards, terraces, balconies and other roof alterations are likely to be acceptable where:

- There is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to re-unite a group of buildings and townscape;
- Alterations are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form;
- There are a variety of additions or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm.

Two storey rear extension at lower ground/ground floor with rear terrace at 1st floor

3.3 The existing rear projections will be demolished and replaced with a full width extension at lower and upper ground floors. The two storey extension will measure 3.3m deep, 5.8m wide with a rear balcony measuring 0.9m deep by 4.1m wide attached at ground level. The extension will be rendered to match the existing property. The terrace will be enclosed with metal railings.

3.4 Given the property's open corner location, any rear extension at upper ground would be highly visible and appear prominent from Herbert Street. It is noted that the property has an existing small outrigger at upper ground floor (less than half width and half depth) which marginally projects above the side boundary wall and the new extension will extend an additional 0.8m above this existing structure.

3.5 It is noted that none of the neighbouring properties within this terrace have a full width extension at upper ground floor, instead some have constructed a modest half width extension at this level. No.105's three storey extension appears to be the exception in terms of height and was granted in 1965; since then planning policy has changed and such a tall extension would not be granted today.

3.6 There are existing balconies within the terrace, No.101 has one at 1st floor and No.105 has one at 2nd floor. It is considered that the balcony is modest in scale with traditional metal railings and given that views of it would be limited in this instance it would be acceptable.

3.7 The proposed full width extension at upper ground would not be supported due to its excessive height and width; in conjunction with the lower floor, this would appear overly bulky, dominant and visually obtrusive from the street. It would not be in keeping with the prevailing character of the rear extensions within this terrace.

3.8 The upper ground floor extension is considered to be oversized and have not been sensitively designed to respect the character and appearance of the host property. A full width extension at this upper ground floor level would not be supported in principle. Given its prominent and open location, it is not considered that terrace at this level would be appropriate in terms of the harm on the character and appearance of the host property, terrace and streetscene.

3.9 The choice of render to match the existing property would be acceptable. The Council would not normally encourage a non-traditional material such as Crittall above the lowest level of the building and there would be some views of this upper ground floor fenestration from the street and material would detract from the rear elevation. Although not shown on the plans the design and access statement states that the extension will have a green roof if the proposal was acceptable details of this would be secured by condition.

Roof extension and terrace

3.10 The proposal will erect a roof extension to incorporate an additional part level to provide a new bathroom and a glazed roof hatch to access a newly created roof terrace. Both these additions would be set below the existing parapet and therefore the roof would not appear materially different from street level.

3.11 It is noted that within this terrace planning permissions for a mansard roof have been granted within the last 10 years for Nos. 101, 107 and 111. No.111 did not implement their permission before

it expired and No.105 has a historic mansard. Therefore it is considered that this property does not form part of an unbroken run of roofs within this terrace and sensitive additions at roof level would be acceptable.

3.12 A front roof terrace is proposed at roof level. It is noted that Nos. 101, 107 and 111 (not implemented) were granted permission for a rear terrace. No.105 which was built without planning permission is the only one with a front terrace. Given that only a terrace and a modest low level roof extension are proposed rather than a mansard and associated terrace a front terrace would be acceptable in this instance. If a mansard was to be erected in the future it would be expected to match those with rear terraces at roof level.

Fenestration/landscaping alterations

3.13 It is noted that upvc fenestration had been introduced to the rear elevation of the property without planning permission at lower ground and 2nd floor. The development will replace all windows with timber double glazing including the 2nd floor window. This second floor window's detailed design is obscured by a drawing number, if the overall development was acceptable further drawings or a condition would be sought to ensure that this window relates to and follows the glazing pattern and opening method of the original windows as the current design detracts from the rear elevation. The replacement of the remaining windows would be appropriate as they match the existing in terms of their siting, detailed design, material (timber) and opening method.

3.14 Replacement of the front basement window with a set of French doors is proposed. The doors will be metal Crittall. It is noted within this terrace that all properties have maintained a traditional timber window in this location. This level is very open and visible from the street given the low front boundary wall. The unsympathetic design, alien materials and scale of opening of the doors would erode the symmetry of the terrace and detract from the character and appearance of the host property, wider terrace and streetscene. This replacement is not acceptable.

3.15 The existing front pillars will be built up to a height of 1.6m (0.2m increase) with a metal railing gate and metal railings installed on top of the front boundary wall. It is noted that while the pillars would match the height of those pillars found at the other end of the terrace, they would be higher than the closer neighbouring properties at No's.109 and 111. There is a slight increase in level of the street in a north direction which accounts for why those properties at the other end of the terrace have higher front boundaries. While it is considered that the new railings and gate would be acceptable the increase in height of the front entrance pillars would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the remainder of the terrace detracting from the character of the host property and the terrace as a whole.

3.16 In the rear garden there is an existing patio at lower ground floor with a set of stairs leading up the higher terrace/ garage. The proposed would seek to extend this lower ground patio to create a useable space in front of the new extension. This would be acceptable.

Conclusion

3.17 The proposed rear extension does not reflect the character and appearance of the terrace it sits within and appears out of proportion in relation to the host property and adjoining properties. Angled views of the rear elevation are possible from Herbert Street. The largely consistent rear elevations of the terrace significantly adds to the group value of the terrace. It is considered that the addition of the full width rear extension would disrupt the historic rhythm, form and pattern of development along the

terrace, eroding its uniformity and group value, to the detriment of the host building, terrace and surrounding area.

3.18. The loss of fenestration uniformity at front basement level and increase in the height of the front pillars are not acceptable.

3.19 The proposed rear extension, by reason of its height, scale, bulk and detailed design, would harm the character and appearance of the host property and the terrace of which it is a part contrary to policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

3.20 The proposed replacement of the front window at basement level with a set of French doors and increase in height of the front pillars would by reason of the unsympathetic design, materials and scale of opening of the doors and the height of the pillars would be out of keeping with the prevailing pattern of development in the remainder of the terrace detracting from the character of the host property and the terrace as a whole contrary to policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

4.0 Amenity

4.1 Local Plan Policy A1 seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected including visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.

4.2 CPG Amenity states that development should be designed in order to ensure that “the proximity, size or cumulative effect of any structures do not have an overbearing and/or dominating effect that is detrimental to the enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers” and that where development is considered to have a detrimental impact upon levels of daylight, sunlight or overshadowing into neighbouring properties, the submission of further evidence of this impact may be required.

4.3 It is noted that the existing extension at lower ground floor sits below the height of the boundary wall with No.111. The proposed extension will project 1.8m above this boundary wall. There are concerns that the two storey rear extension, with its excessive height (1.8m above the shared boundary wall), depth (3.3m) and siting on the boundary, that it would appear overbearing and could result in a loss of light and a sense of enclosure to the adjoining property at No.111. No daylight or sunlight report has been provided to demonstrate that this is not the case.

4.4 At ground floor the proposed rear terrace has a modest depth of 0.9 and is set away from the side of the extension. It is not considered to result in loss of privacy or overlooking.

4.5 At roof level given the roof extensions do not project above the existing parapet they are not considered to create any amenity concerns. The terrace at roof level is not considered to result in any harmful overlooking, given its location at the front, separation distance to neighbouring property's windows and lack of other front terraces in close proximity within the terrace.

4.6 The fenestration, front boundary alterations and rear garden alterations proposed are not considered to result in harm to the any of the neighbouring properties given their siting, scale and detailed design.

5.0 Conclusion

5.1 The proposed rear extension, replacement of the front window at basement level and increase in the height of the front pillars, by reason of their detailed design, height, scale, bulk and siting, would harm the character and appearance of the host property, terrace and wider area contrary to policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

5.2 In absence of a daylight and sunlight report, the proposed two storey rear extension, by reason of its siting and excessive scale, would result in potential loss of light to No.111 Queen's Crescent contrary to policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Refuse planning permission.