

# REPORT FOR INDEPENDENT INSPECTOR

## 6 South View



## 1. Matter for Consideration

- 1.1 The appellant subject of this appeal sought consent for - Part single, part two storey rear extensions, new side first floor windows, front garage door and alterations to garage door opening, insertion of rooflights, plus removal of chimney.

## 2. Background

- 2.1 The subject property is Leasehold. The surrounding area is designated as **Heritage Character Area**. The property is also a Home of Special Interest.
- 2.2 The following is a description of the property taken from Mervyn Millers study:

*Nos. 6 and 8, detached houses linked by garages, Architects: Bennett and Bidwell (1926). Fairly conventional though good-mannered houses of a type, which became popular during the mid-1920s, and variants of which were also designed by other architects. This group consists almost wholly of variations on this type. Red brick, Flemish Bond, with a dominant gable on*

*the garage side projecting slightly forward of the remainder. Casement windows throughout, soldier arches above the three-light first floor window in the gable, which also has tile-creased corbels to support the eaves. The entrance is recessed within a two-header semi-circular arch. Both houses have been well maintained and retain their original timber windows. The front doors and sidelights appear to be original. The linking garages are flat-roofed and retain their original boarded side-hung doors, with small paned upper lights. Gabled front to main hipped roof and tall brick slab-like chimneys with brick oversailing courses and low pots. No. 6 provides a buffer to the car park of the adjoining Nexus building. Building of Local Merit.*

2.3 The property has been the subject of the most recent applications:

<b>Nature of Works</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
Rear Conservatory	Approved July 2005
Refurbishment of chimney and restoration of garage	Approved September 2009
Rear Conservatory following removal of existing	Approved March 2011
Two storey rear extension, replacement windows and front garage door (revised scheme)	Refused at HAC February 2023
Part single, part two storey rear extensions, new side first floor window, replacement windows, front garage door and alterations to garage door opening, insertion of rooflights	Refused at HAC following AMC February 2024
Part single, Part two storey rear extensions, new side first floor windows, front garage door and alterations to garage door opening, insertion of rooflights	Refused at HAC following AMC October 2024

2.4 Planning permission 23/01775/FPH was granted in September 2023 for: Part single and part two storey rear extension, replace existing rear garage French window with a door and window and insertion of rooflights to existing rear roofslope following demolition of existing rear conservatory and chimney stack.

2.5 Location plan and Photographs are available in **Appendix A**.

### 3. Application

- 3.1 We initially received an application for a two-storey rear extension, replacement windows and front garage door in November 2022. Following negotiations, a revised scheme was submitted in January 2023. We received two neighbour comments, and this application was considered and refused by the Householder Applications Committee (HAC) in February 2023.
- 3.2 Another application for a part single, part two storey rear extensions, new side first floor window, replacement windows, front garage door and alterations to garage door opening, insertion of rooflights was received in May 2023. We received one neighbour comment. This application was considered and refused by the HAC in July 2023. The owners asked for this decision to be reviewed by the Advisory Management Committee (AMC) and the HAC again refused the application following AMC in February 2024.
- 3.3 In April 2024 another application for part single, part two storey rear extensions, new side first floor windows, front garage door and alterations to garage door opening, insertion of rooflights was made. Although not included in the title, it was also proposed to remove one of the existing chimneys. We received a call from the neighbour at 8 South View who stated that he wanted his previous objection to stand. This application was considered and refused by Heritage Advice Service in May 2024. The owners asked for this decision to be reviewed by AMC.
- 3.4 The application was refused on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2024.
- 3.5 The homeowner sought a review by the AMC on 4<sup>th</sup> September 2024. The AMC unanimously upheld the decision of HAS and it was refused at the Householders Application Committee on 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2024.

### 4. Lease covenants and the Design Principles

- 4.1 The subject property is a leasehold property. The relevant covenant within the lease states:
- (i) Not to make any alteration materially affecting the external appearance of any building walls fences or other erections on the premises or make any addition thereto without the written consent of the Corporation in accordance with plans drawings and specifications previously submitted to and approved by the Corporation
  - (ii) To comply with the Town and Country Planning Acts and the building regulations in relation to any alteration or addition for which written consent has been given.
  - (iii) To make any alteration and addition in accordance with the approved plans drawings and specifications in a good substantial and workmanlike manner with sound and proper materials.
- 4.2 The Design Principles for the Modern Character Area state –

#### **Pg 8 - Rear Extensions**

- The area and volume of the proposed extension shall be subservient and in proportion to the existing house and plot.
- An appropriate rear garden should be provided to ensure that an adequate private amenity provision is retained and to prevent a cramped or over-developed appearance.
- Ground floor and 2 storey extensions up to a depth of 5 metres from the original main rear building line of the house may be acceptable. When 2 storey extensions have a harmful impact on neighbouring properties, a reduction in depth and/or width may be required.

### **Pg 23 - Chimneys and flues**

- Other than in exceptional circumstances, existing chimneys stacks or pots should not be removed.

## **5. Issues**

- 5.1 Although the proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension complies with Design Principles, due to the size of the plot and proximity to neighbouring properties it was considered that extending at first floor would be an overdevelopment of the plot due to the increased massing at 1<sup>st</sup> floor level.
- 5.2 The removal of the chimney is contrary to Design Principles.
- 5.3 6 South View is located directly onto Broadway Gardens which is a Grade II registered Park and Garden. The Gardens effectively form the centre of Parker and Unwin's masterplan. Although it has seen a few iterations, it is a landmark, and the AMC were conscious of the impact of the appearance of the side elevation on the setting of the Gardens.

## **6. AMC Comments**

- 6.1 The Committee felt the proposal to be balanced within the context of the site, and noted that the footprint will not change
- 6.2 The Committee felt that the proposal may appear overbearing but agreed it did not constitute overdevelopment of the plot.
- 6.3 The Committee felt that the extension should be set back 450-600 mm, to break up the side elevation and appear less overbearing to the amenity area.
- 6.4 The Committee felt the blind window to be an unnecessary addition.
- 6.5 During the site visit, the agent confirmed that the rooflight will be conservation style.
- 6.6 The Committee members were unanimous in recommending that the Householder Applications Committee re-consider the decision to refuse consent, made by the Heritage Advice Service. This is based on the

Committee's recommendation within point 6.3.

## **7. HAC Comments**

- 7.1 The Committee carried out a site visit to the property and met with the agent.
- 7.2 The Committee noted the AMC's comments and recommendation.
- 7.3 AMC Chair re-iterated the AMC's comments regarding the extension and surrounding amenity space.
- 7.4 AMC Chair advised that the AMC's concerns related to the view of the flank end of the property adjacent to the amenity space; however, the AMC felt that should the first-floor element be recessed back from the host property, this would reduce the bulk and visual impact onto the amenity space.
- 7.5 HAC felt that the original decision should be upheld. Comments related to small plot size, mass of the first-floor element and loss of chimney; and agreed to uphold the original decision.
- 7.6 The Committee discussed the proximity to the neighbouring property.
- 7.7 The Committee discussed the approval of the neighbouring property's extension, but noted the larger plot size and it was a side extension and not a rear extension.
- 7.8 The Committee agreed that should the first-floor element be recessed back; the massing would still be excessive and visually impacting on the amenity space.
- 7.9 The HAC agreed that the application shall be refused.

## **8. Conclusion**

- 8.1 Although the AMC felt that the first-floor element may be acceptable if it were to be reduced in depth, the HAC were still of the opinion that any addition at first floor would be overbearing and visually impact the amenity space.
- 8.2 Overall, it is our view that the application represents a clear breach of the Design Principles, which have been carefully formulated to avoid this type of alteration. The application fails to preserve the character and appearance of the existing property and the Heritage Character Area.
- 8.3 It is therefore respectfully requested that this appeal is dismissed

