

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	09/10/2013
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	06/09/2013
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Paul Gardiner			2013/5179/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
7 Ardwick Road London NW2 2BX			Refer to decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Rear first Floor Extension to existing single family dwellinghouse (Class C3)					
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	06	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>One objection received with the following summarised concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overdevelopment in terms of excessive scale, and height of the resultant extension. • Overbearing impact and increased sense of enclosure to neighbouring properties • Overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring properties • Incongruous design, out of keeping with neighbouring properties • Loss of daylight and sunlight to adjoining neighbouring properties 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	N/A					

Site Description

The application relates to a three-storey, semi-detach dwelling located on the southern side of Ardwick Road. The dwelling has been modified by a number of insensitive extensions and alterations, in the past. In particular, the overscaled front porch detracts from the otherwise well-balanced façade.

Relevant History

2696 - Alterations to form habitable rooms in the attic and the construction of dormer windows in the roof. **Granted 15/06/1960.**

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan 2011

Core Strategy:

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development policies:

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

Camden Planning Guidance:

CGP1- Design

CPG6- Amenity

Assessment

Proposal:

Planning permission is sought of a first floor rear extension. The proposed extension would be located above an existing single-storey extension, replacing a part-width 'cat-slide' roof in this location. No planning permission exists for this structure, however, it is assumed that it has been completed as permitted development.

The proposed extension would be 6m in height to the eaves, matching the eaves height of the main building. The extension would be 8m in height to the ridge of the proposed dual-pitched roof. The roof would be hipped at a matching pitch to the roof of the existing dwelling. The extension would project 3.2m from the original first floor rear wall and would be 4.2m in width, matching the dimensions of the existing single-storey extension. The proposal would facilitate the creation of an ensuite bathroom at first floor level.

Assessment

The main planning matters raised by this application are:

- Impact on the character and appearance of the host building
- Impact on amenity

These are assessed below in the context of planning policy and other material considerations

Impact on the character and appearance of the host building

CPG1 (Design) chapter 4 (paragraphs 4.10 - 4.15) requires extensions to be designed proportionally in relation to the existing buildings and groups of buildings, and in particular should appear secondary to the host building in terms of form, scale and proportion. Rear extensions should also respect the historic pattern of the townscape in regards to the ratio of built and un-built space as well as the rhythm of existing rear extensions. There are first floor extensions in the vicinity, however, each case is considered on individual merit, context and site constraints.

Although not particularly encouraged, the proposed first floor extension would be generally suitable to the architectural style of the original building, and would not result in a significant adverse impact to its design and appearance. The bulk of the extension is minimised by the hipped roof profile and would be appropriately subordinate to the main dwelling. As such the proposal would be broadly acceptable in design terms.

Amenity

As the application relates to a corner property, the extension would be prominently visible from the ground floor level of the rear of the properties along Ranulf Road. No.1 Ranulf Road benefits from a ground floor open-plan kitchen dining room opening out on to a terrace in this location. No.1 also benefits from a ground floor artists studio, looking out onto this space from the rear of the original property. The proposed extension would be in close proximity to this open amenity area, and would appear as a large blank, flat wall in this sensitive location. As a result the proposal would appear overly dominant, resulting in an unacceptable enclosing impact.

The proposal would not breach the 45 degree angle when measured from the middle of the windows serving the ground floor kitchen/dining area or the artist's studio, and is unlikely to result in an unacceptable loss of light to either of these rooms. However, the proposal would appear to result in additional overshadowing of the outdoor amenity space, in particular during the early morning. The proposal is considered to unacceptably affect the residential amenity of the neighbouring property and their ability to enjoy their only outdoor amenity space, and is recommended for refusal on this basis.

The proposed first floor extension, by means of excessive depth, height and bulk in close proximity to the boundary and outdoor amenity space of the adjoining property, would result in an unacceptable overbearing and dominating impact, to the detriment of the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Camden Local Development Framework policies CS5, DP24, DP26, and Camden Planning Guidance 6 – 'Amenity',

Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission