

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	7/02/2020
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	16/11/2019
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Alyce Jeffery			2019/4710/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
3 Hillfield Road London NW6 1QD			See draft 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 a single storey side/rear extension.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	00	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	08
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed on 23/10/2019 that expired on 16/11/2019.</p> <p>Eight objections were received from adjoining residents following the statutory consultation period; Flat A and B no. 2, no. 4, Flat 1 and 2 no. 5, no. 5 and no. 7 Hillfield Road. Responses are summarised below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site, harmful to character of property and wider area. <i>(Officer comment: See para 2.5)</i></li><li>• Unacceptable internal layout due to length of extension and ground floor levels. <i>(Officer comment: Habitable rooms within the property are located are the front and rear of the ground floor and receive acceptable natural light via windows and rooflights)</i></li><li>• Drawings and Design &amp; Access statement are misleading and inaccurate with regards to existing fencing and ground levels. <i>(Officer comment: See para 2.13)</i></li><li>• Loss of daylight/sunlight to adjoining properties. <i>(Officer comment: See para 2.10)</i></li><li>• Sense of enclosure to adjoining properties. <i>(Officer comment: See para 2.11)</i></li><li>• Building materials and incomplete development on the site for years leaving unsightly mess and rat infestation. <i>(Officer comment: Not a planning consideration therefore officers cannot response to this comment)</i></li><li>• Loss of garden area for bird species and trees etc. <i>(Officer comment: The gardens along Hillfield Road are deep and vegetated, officers consider that sufficient open space would be retained)</i></li><li>• Should not grant anymore applications until the owner completes granted building works to property across the road no. 2 Hillfield Road. <i>(Officer comment: Not a planning consideration therefore officers cannot response to this comment)</i></li><li>• The extensions have been submitted in various applications overtime and do not represent a harmonious design. <i>(Officer comment: Applicant can submit various applications overtime, the design is assessed as a whole)</i></li></ul>					

## Site Description

The site comprises a two storey (plus basement and roof accommodation) red brick terrace property and is occupied as a single family dwelling. The site is located on the northern side of Hillfield Road which is characterised by terraced properties with similarly sized rear gardens that are predominated by vegetation and trees.

## Relevant History

**2014/1573/P** - Single storey ground floor rear extension (2.9 metres maximum height and 7 metres from rear wall of original dwellinghouse by 4.1 metres width) – **Refused Prior Approval** 08/04/2014. Reasons for refusal;

*(1) The proposed extension, by reason of its scale and bulk would result in a dominant addition which would have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of the adjoining neighbour at No. 1 Hillfield Road. The proposal therefore fails to comply with Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) (England) Order 2013.*

**2014/3319/P** - The erection of a rear dormer roof extension with Juliet balcony and the installation of 1 x rooflight to the front and 2 x rooflights to the rear roof slopes of single dwelling house – **Granted** 11/06/2014.

**2014/3320/P** - Erection of single storey rear extension – **Granted** 03/06/2014.

**2015/2075/P** - The erection of a single storey rear infill and rear extension ground floor level – **Withdrawn** 26/08/2015.

**2015/4977/P** - Erection of single storey rear extension – **Refused** 09/12/2015. Reasons for refusal;  
*(1) The proposal is not considered to be permitted development because the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse will be within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage of the dwellinghouse, and the height of the eaves of the enlarged part would exceed 3 metres, contrary to section A.1(i) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 and as such a Certificate of Lawfulness cannot be issued;*

*(2) The proposal is not considered to be permitted development because the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would extend beyond a wall forming a side elevation of the original dwellinghouse, and as such would have a width greater than half the width of the original dwellinghouse, contrary to section A.1(j)(iii) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 as such a Certificate of Lawfulness cannot be issued.*

**2015/4978/P** - Certificate of Proposed Lawful Development erection of single-storey rear extension to single dwellinghouse – **Withdrawn** 18/09/2015.

**2015/4981/P** – Single storey side/rear extension – **Granted** 26/10/2015.

**2015/5336/P** – Erection of single storey rear extension (6m deep x 3.5m wide x 1.6m to eaves and 3.2m to highest point of roof) – **Appeal Allowed** 14/03/2016.

**2015/5702/P** - Erection of single storey rear extension (6m deep x 3.5m wide x 1.6m to eaves and 3.2m to highest point of roof) – **Withdrawn** 27/10/2015.

**2019/4621/P** - Erection of a single storey side/rear extension – **Currently under consideration.**

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework 2019

### The London Plan 2016, consolidated with alterations since 2011

### Draft London Plan consolidated suggested changes version (July 2019)

### The Camden Local Plan 2017

Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development)

Policy D1 (Design)

### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Design

CPG Amenity

### Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015

Policy 2 Design and Character

## Assessment

### 1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of single storey ground floor side/rear extension. The extension would project 7.6m from the rear elevation of the existing side extension (10.5m from the original side rear elevation), measure 2.4 in width and infill the space between the boundary shared with no. 5 Hillfield and the existing rear outrigger. The existing side extension has been partially constructed (at the time of the officer site visit the side extension did not have a rear elevation) and measures 3m in depth, 4m in height, 2.4m in width and features a sloped roof. The applicant seeks to further develop the existing extension. The site slopes to the south, therefore the rear garden would be cut to facilitate the proposed rear extension.

1.2 The extension would feature a flat felt roof and include 3 rooflights. The rooflights would sit flush with the roof. The extension would be constructed from bricks to match the existing building and feature a double window to the rear elevation.

### 2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main considerations associated with the application are:

- Design and character
- Impact on amenity

#### Design and character

2.2 Policy D1 (Design) of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;
- the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;
- the composition of elevations;
- the suitability of the proposed design to its intended use;
- inclusive design and accessibility;
- its contribution to public realm and its impact on views and vistas; and
- the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value.

2.3 The above guidance is echoed within policy 2 (Design & Character) of the Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, which states that ‘all development shall be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead.’ In particular, paragraph vii. states that extensions and infill development should be ‘in character and proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties.’

2.4 Officers note that a number of properties along Hillfield Road benefit from side infill and rear extensions however the existing extensions are much more modest in overall size, are subordinate to the host dwelling and are appropriate in their context. Officers also acknowledge that development has been granted and implemented through permitted development rights on the site (Single storey side/rear extension ref 2015/4981/P, granted 26/10/2015 and ‘Erection of single storey rear extension (6m deep x 3.5m wide x 1.6m to eaves and 3.2m to highest point of roof’ ref 2015/5336/P, appeal allowed 14/03/2016), therefore officers consider it is appropriate to assess the cumulative impact of development and consider whether further development of this site is acceptable, considering this application seeks to create a large open plan space.

2.5 The combined scale and bulk of the permitted and proposed extension on site, is considered excessive in the context of the 2 storey terrace dwelling and the surrounding properties. The proposed depth of the extension would be deeper than that of the existing building. Officers consider that the proposed extension would appear a bulky appendage rather than a subordinate and proportionate extension to the host building resulting in considerable harm.

2.6 Due to its excessive scale, bulk and mass, the proposed extension would not replicate the existing rhythm or composition of the rear elevation along Hillfield Road. Overall, the proposed development fails to respect the prevailing pattern and grain of development to the rear of Hillfield Road, and is therefore considered harmful to the character and appearance of the property and wider area, contrary to the above mentioned policies.

#### Detailed design

2.6 The proposed extension would be constructed from brick work to match the existing property. This would complement the architectural style and age of the existing building. Officers raise no objection to a flat felt roof, rooflights or windows.

#### Amenity

2.7 Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the Camden Local Plan seeks to ensure that the existing residential amenities of neighbouring properties are protected, particularly with regard to visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing, noise and vibration levels.

2.8 The main property that is likely to be affected by the proposal are the occupants at no. 5 Hillfield Road. Owing to the existing rear development and siting of the proposed development, officers do not consider the adjoining occupants at no. 1 Hillfield Road would be impacted by the proposal. Similarly, owing to the sloping land and deep gardens along Hillfield Road, officers do not consider that the occupants to the rear of the site (South Mansions) would be impacted by the proposal.

#### Overlooking / Loss of privacy

2.9 Owing to the orientation of the windows at the rear elevation and the height of the side boundary walls, officers do not consider that there would be any direct overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties.

#### Daylight and sunlight

2.10 The BRE guidelines for assessing the skylight impact of extensions adopt a “45° approach” and advise a line be drawn in elevation diagonally down at an angle of 45° away from the top of the development and in plan diagonally back at an angle of 45° towards an affected window. If the centre of a window lies on the development side of both the 45° lines then the development may well cause

a significant reduction in skylight. The centre of the ground floor rear elevation window and the side facing window on the rear outrigger of no. 5 both lie within the 45° lines therefore officers consider that there would be an unreasonable impact on the daylight awarded to the occupants at no. 5 Hillfield Road. The applicant has not provided a daylight/sunlight assessment to demonstrate that the proposal would not result in a loss of daylight/sunlight awarded to the adjoining occupants.

#### Sense of enclosure and loss of outlook

2.11 The proposed extension would measure 3.2m in height along the side boundary and would extend 10.5m in length beyond the rear elevation of the neighbouring property at no. 5. Owing to the height and excessive depth along the shared boundary, together with the sloping land, officers consider that the extension would result in an overwhelming sense of enclosure and have a significant impact on the outlook enjoyed by the adjoining occupants residing at no. 5 Hillfield.

#### Noise and disturbance

2.12 Owing to the residential nature of the ground floor development, officers do not consider the proposal would result in unreasonable noise and disturbance to neighbouring properties.

#### Other

2.13 Officers are concerned that the drawings submitted in support of the application show the true ground floor level of the subject site or the adjoining site no. 5 Hillfield. It was evident on site that the ground level of no. 3 is higher than no. 5, however this is not accurately shown or annotated on the drawings.

### **3.0 Recommendation**

3.1 Refuse planning permission