Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet N/A		Expiry Date:	<b>06/12/2012</b> 22/11/2012		
				Consultation Expiry Date:			
Officer			Application	on Number(s)			
Craig Raybould			2012/5466	6/P			
Application Addr	oss		Drawing	Numbers			
70 St. Augustines			Drawing	Numbers			
London			Refer to d	Refer to draft decision			
NW1 9RP							
PO 3/4 Ar	ea Team Signatu	ıre C&UD	Authorise	ed Officer Signature			
I O 5/4	ca ream oignate	are Gaob	Admonst	sa Omocr Orginature			
Proposal(s)							
Frection of front ex	xtension to existin	g basement level	side addition o	n flank of dwelling house	(Class C3)		
Libouon or none of	Atomorori to oxiotiri	g bacomont lover	oldo dddilloll o	Triank or awaiing nead	(0.000 00).		
Recommendation	n(s): Grant p	lanning permiss	ion				
Application Type: Househo		older Application					
		отаст у франсацио					
Conditions or Reasons							
for Refusal:	Refer to	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:	I KOICI LO						

Consultations									
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	02	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00			
			No. electronic	00					
Summary of consultation responses:	A press notice was placed in the Ham & High newspaper from 01/11/2012 to 22/11/2012.  A site notice was displayed from 26/10/2012 to 16/11/2012.  No comments have been received from neighbours.								
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	The Canden Square CAAC were consulted on 23/10/2012.  The CAAC objected on the following grounds:  The drawings are technically inaccurate;  The height and volume of the extension are inappropriate;  Its dimensions do not relate to neighbouring buildings;  The extension does not support the rhythm of the neighbouring buildings;  The proposed materials do not support historic precedent;  The extension contradicts the CAA&MS (para 7.4);  Its brick façade would look alien in comparison to the side entrance gates found on other neighbouring buildings.  Officer comments:  The drawings have been checked and are technically accurate. All other points are discussed below in paras 2.1 to 2.5 below.								

# **Site Description**

The application site is a semi-detached 3 storey plus semi-basement single family dwelling house located midway along St Augustine Road on its south-west aspect. To the front there is a Doric porch and the ground floor is finished in a channelled stucco. The remaining facades are finished in a London stock brick. Windows are timber framed sash with stucco surrounds.

To the side of the building at ground floor level there is an existing lean-to extension with glazed roof set back 2.5m from the front of the building line.

The property is located within the Camden Square Conservation Area and is identified as making a positive contribution to its special character.

## **Relevant History**

No relevant history.

### **Relevant policies**

## **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage)

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

## Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 (Design) - paras 4.16-4.18.

CPG6 (Amenity)

Camden Square Conservation Area Statement and Management Strategy (2011) - para 7.4.

The London Plan (2011) The NPPF 2012

#### Assessment

## 1. Proposals

- 1.1 The application proposes an extension to the existing ground floor lean-to extension to the flank elevation of the property. The proposed extension measures 2.1m in length and 0.8m in width (a floor area of 1.68sqm) and would be erected to a height of 1.9m to the pitch. It would essentially form a continuation of the existing side extension but with a brick frontage.
- 1.2 The key planning considerations arising from the proposals are:
  - Design and conservation; and
  - Residential amenity.

### 2. Analysis

### Design

- 2.1 CPG1 (Design) provides design advice in relation to the erection of side extensions. It explains that: "The infilling of gaps [between buildings] will not be considered acceptable where:
- significant views or gaps are compromised or blocked;
- the established front building line is compromised;
- the architectural symmetry or integrity of a composition is impaired;
- the original architectural features on a side wall are obscured; or
- access to the rear of a property is lost".
- 2.2 The Camden Square CAAMS (2011) identifies that gaps between buildings are an important feature in this CA and their infilling will be resisted where they are formed between semi-detached and detached properties.
- 2.3 The Camden Square CAAC have objected to the proposals on design grounds mainly in respect of the design criteria set out in CPG1.
- 2.4 The proposed extension would form a continuation of the existing side extension bringing it forward towards the front of the building, using a matching glazed roof. Its size would be subordinate to the main building and would be no higher than a traditional side gate here nor other side wings established along this street. Owing to its single storey nature and the presence of the existing side extension, the proposals would not compromise any views or gaps between buildings and would be barely visible in longer views from across the street. It

would not disrupt any pattern in the building line or disrupt the symmetry between these semi-detached houses in any harmful manner. Access to the garden via the side of the house has already been lost as a result of the existing side extension. Although the plans show the brickwork to match the existing garden wall, this is considered inappropriate as the new boundary wall is in an incongruous red brick, so it is considered that a condition be imposed so that the brickwork finish should match the prevailing stock brick materials of the main house which would help recess the extension in street views. The proposals therefore meet with the guidance set out in CPG1 and the Camden Square CAAMS.
2.5 The extension considered to have a minimal impact on the appearance of the building and the Camden Square Conservation Area. The proposals comply with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25.
Amenity
2.6 The proposals do not raise any concerns in respect of overlooking, overshadowing, noise, fumes or general disturbance. It complies with policies CS5 and DP26.
3. Recommendation: Grant planning permission.

# **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2012. For further information please click <u>here.</u>