

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		06/02/2013	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		04/01/2013	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Miheer Mehta				2012/6461/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
98 Maygrove Road London NW6 2ED				Refer to decision letter			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of single storey rear ground floor level extension in connection with existing dwelling house (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission with conditions					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	05	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
Summary of consultation responses:		No response to date.					
CAAC/Local groups comments:		N/A					

Site Description

The application site is located on the south side of Maygrove Road. It is a mid-terrace two storey property that is arranged as a house. The building has an original three storey rear extension.

The building is not listed and is not located within a conservation area.

Relevant History

26/06/2001 (PWX0103406) Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed) made **Lawful** for:
Application for certificate of lawfulness for proposed development for: Extension at roof level, including the erection of a rear dormer, two roof lights in the front roof slope and one at the rear.

14/12/2012 (2012/6461/P) Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed) **Currently under assessment** for:
Erection of 2 x single storey rear ground floor level extensions in connection with existing dwelling house (Class C3).

96 Maygrove Road

17/12/2010 (2010/5850/P) planning permission **Granted** for:
Erection of single storey side rear extension and infill extension to the side of an existing ground floor flat (Class C3).

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

CS1 (distribution of growth);
CS4 (Areas of more limited change);
CS5 (managing the impact of growth and development);
CS6 (provide quality homes);
CS13 (promote higher environmental standards);
CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage);

Development Policies

DP2 (Make full use of Camden's capacity for housing);
DP24 (secure high quality design);
DP26 (manage the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours);
DP29 (improve access)

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design

Assessment

Proposal

The proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to the rear elevation at ground floor level in connection with the existing dwelling house (Class C3).

The proposed extension would be single-storey with a flat roof and two rooflights. The extension would be located between the boundary wall with no. 96 and would run along the full depth of the back addition and lean-to of the application property. The total depth would be 7.45m and the height would be 3.05m. The rear elevation would comprise 5 French doors. The external wall and window of the single storey small lean-to structure would be demolished and removed.

Bricks would match existing, the extension would be brick built, the sliding doors would be double glazed aluminium doors.

The proposed rear elevation of the single storey extension would sit behind the adjoining extensions at no.96 and no.100. The flank wall of the proposed extension would be 3.05m high and would act as a boundary wall with no. 96. No. 96 has a void area between the window on the rear elevation of the ground floor of the main building and its recently constructed 'L-shaped' rear extension. This window serves a second bedroom and the void area acts as a lightwell to the ground floor flat.

Background

There is a parallel application for a certificate of lawful development for two single storey extensions at the same site (Ref: 2012/6467/P). The assessment for this indicates that each extension falls within the parameters for permitted development.

Design

Rear extensions should be subordinate to, and respect the original design and proportions of the main building, as well respecting the historic pattern and established grain of the surrounding area. A full-width extension is generally discouraged if it is considered that it would conflict with CPG advice. An open space 1.5m(w) to the side would be infilled, this would add to the bulk of the rear extension. However, the neighbouring extension at no. 96 Maygrove Road towers above the existing infill area and would make full use of the narrow open space to the side that is of very little practical value. It would not be visible from the public realm and given the height and a fence to the rear; there would be no direct views from the rear of Loveridge Road properties that back onto the rear garden of the site. The rear extension proposed would be shallow in depth when compared to the larger extensions to the adjoining properties and a reasonable sized garden would be retained. The infill extension would also provide for an improved appearance to the rear elevation.

Given all of the above and because the site is not located within a conservation area, the proposed extension, alterations to fenestration and materials are considered acceptable and in line with LDF policies.

Amenity

The installation of an extension within this infill location would increase the height of the boundary wall between the application site and No. 96 for a length of 3.6m. This increase to the section of the boundary in front of the bedroom window to No. 96, would impact upon the living conditions of the neighbouring property. However, the existing situation with the overall size and depth of the rear extension at no. 96 towering the boundary wall with no.98 and the fact that the applicant has submitted an application under lawful development (which has been found to be) for an extension which would also sit adjacent to the light well at no. 96 needs to be considered. The rear extension which permitted development allows would not fully enclose the courtyard at no. 96 and there would be a gap of approximately 0.6m. Therefore, the proposal would have a greater impact.

The light intake and outlook to the window serving this second bedroom of the neighbouring property will be affected. It currently has poor amenity, and it is accepted that this is not a reason to make it

worse, and can be a reason to ensure that the situation gets no worse. However, due to the matters referred to above, as well as the overall size of the adjoining ground floor flat, with the bedroom window being one of three bedrooms to the flat, the fact that the flat has sole use of the main garden area to the rear which is south facing and although there may be some impact, it is considered unlikely to be significant enough to warrant refusal of the application. The fallback position of the rear extension that could be built at no. 98 is a consideration, as it would appear that the amenity of this window cannot remain unaltered, but it is not decisive and the decision has been reached having regard to a number of factors.

It is considered that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on sunlight/daylight, outlook or privacy of one of the bedrooms, but that there are mitigating circumstances to indicate why the permission should not be refused. Therefore, although not in compliance with LDF policies CS5 (managing the impact of growth and development) and DP26 (manage the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) this is not a reason for refusal.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant permission.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613