

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		12/03/2014	
		N/A		Consultation Expiry Date:		20/02/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Tessa Craig				2014/0402/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
16 St. Pauls Crescent London NW1 9XL				See decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a single storey rear extension.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse planning permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	05	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>Five neighbours were notified by post. The proposal was advertised in the Ham & High on the 30th January 2014 and a site notice was erected on the 24th January.</p> <p>A response has been received from the neighbour at 14 St Pauls Crescent stating:</p> <p><i>"I object to the application on the grounds that the proposed height of the extension will significantly impact on the sunlight coming into my property, especially in the adjoining patio."</i></p> <p><u>Officer comment</u> Impact on the neighbouring property is addressed in point 2.4 below.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		Camden Square CAAC- No response received.					

Site Description

The subject site is located on the west side of St. Pauls Crescent and comprises a three storey, brick terraced property. The property is located within the Camden Square conservation area but is not a listed building.

Relevant History

None.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 (Distribution of Growth)

CS5 (Managing the Impact of Growth and Development)

CS14 (Promoting High Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage)

DP24 (Securing High Quality Design)

DP26 (Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design 1, 2, 3 and 4

CPG6 Amenity 1, 6, 7

Camden Square Conservation Area Appraisal and management Strategy

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey rear extension. The extension would be 3.1m high, approximately 7.1m wide (full width) and 1.2m deep beyond the existing rear extension (existing extension is 3.1m deep) and approximately 30m². The extension would be 4.7m from the original rear elevation of the property. The proposed extension would include a glass rooflight on the south side of the property, next to the rear wall of the main dwelling. Three sliding glass doors are proposed in the rear elevation. The extension would be constructed from London stock brick and render and a sedum roof with metal flashings.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are design and impact on the conservation area, and the impact on neighbouring amenity. These points are addressed below.

Design/Impact on Conservation Area

2.2 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance.

2.3 The subject property forms one in a group of five terraced properties. Although there are examples of rear extensions and tunnel backs in the group of properties, some of these rear projections are original features. None of the group includes full width rear extensions and a search of Council records does not bring up any results for planning permission for rear extensions, therefore it is likely the extensions were completed prior to the current policies which guide decisions for rear extensions (identified above).

2.4 It is considered the depth, height and width of the rear extension is overly large and unsympathetic to the host building. The fenestration details do not reflect the materials of the main dwelling and include a large glass elevation. The proposed extension is considered an incongruous feature which would not fit the context of the terraced group of properties, would be detrimental to the

character of the conservation area and result in loss of garden space. The proposal is considered unacceptable in terms of design and bulk.

Amenity

2.5 Policy CS5 seeks to protect the amenity of Camden's residents by ensuring the impact of development is fully considered. Furthermore Policy DP26 seeks to ensure that development protects the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of neighbouring residents. This includes privacy, overlooking, outlook and implications on daylight and sunlight. CPG6 seeks for developments to be "designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree."

2.6 An objection has been received from the neighbour at 14 St Pauls Crescent to the north of the subject site. It is considered the proposed extension by way of its excessive depth and height would impact on neighbour's outlook and has the potential to impact daylight and sunlight levels at the adjacent property. The proposal would not however, cause overlooking or loss of privacy.

3.0 Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission

3.1 The proposal is considered an overly dominant and large extension, with poor design, unsympathetic to the host building and the character of the conservation area. Furthermore, the proposal would result in a negative impact on privacy and the potential for loss of daylight and sunlight to the neighbouring property at number 14 St Pauls Crescent. The proposal is inconsistent with the policies and guidance identified above and is therefore recommended for refusal on design and amenity grounds.