

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	03/12/2012
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	15/11/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
John Nicholls			2012/5296/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
4 Brookfield Park London NW5 1ER			See decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Extension and alterations to include erection of a full width single storey rear extension, replacement of dormer at rear roofslope, alterations to the front elevation involving new canopy over front bay and entrance, and enlargement of bay window at front first floor level to dwelling.					
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	10	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
			No. Electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:	A Site Notice was displayed on 17/10/2012 and a Press Notice on 25/10/2012. No comments have been received as a result of this consultation.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee has commented as follows:					
	<u>Rear extension</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The proposed extension increases the existing footprint by some 50%, which is unacceptable; it is much greater than rear extensions elsewhere in Brookfield Park, several of which are pre-DPCAAC and therefore not precedents in any case.					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The bulk of this very large extension is furthermore proposed to be of dark grey zinc cladding, with a roof of the same material, whereas the characteristic material of the neighbouring houses at the back is a pale brick.					
	An officer's comment on these matters can be found in paragraphs 1.3 and 2.7-2.9.					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The extension, despite the reduction in height on the kitchen element would also block the view to the south-east and St Mary, Brookfield, which the neighbours have always enjoyed. It would also be visible from Kingswear Road, although from Croftdown Road the high (illegal) hedge above the perimeter fence of No.2 Brookfield Park would hide it.					
	An officer's comment on these matters can be found in paragraphs 1.3 and 2.9-2.10.					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The decking 'to continue to the exterior' to an unascertained extent is excessive.					
	An officer's comment on these matters can be found in paragraph 2.14.					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The proposed extension therefore fails to consider the 'character, scale, context and scale of neighbouring buildings' as required by Policy DP24 (a) and likewise fails to consider 'the character and proportions of the existing building' (Policy DP24 (b)).					
	An officer's comment on these matters can be found in paragraph 2.11.					
	<u>Green Roof</u>					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The very large open-plan interior would also create a need for additional energy resources in heating. Were the council minded to approve a smaller extension, brick should be the required material,					

and the extension roof to be 'green'.

An officer's comment on these matters can be found in paragraph 2.12.

Dormer

- We further object to the proposed alteration of the rear roofscape in substituting the cockpit terrace for a large dormer. If a dormer is permitted it should be smaller than as shown, and should terminate vertically in a gable to assimilate with the roof of the adjoining wing.

An officer's comment on these matters can be found in paragraphs 2.16-2.17.

Front elevation

- However, the proposed alterations to front of the property, on the other hand, may enhance the CA, assimilating the facade of no. 4 to that of the neighbouring (semi-detached) houses.
- It is however essential that the proposed canopy correspond as closely as possible with those of its neighbours. In particular, we are concerned that no provision is made for rainwater discharge or conservation: there should be gutters of cast iron (or possibly aluminium): but on no account of plastic.

An officer's comment on these matters can be found in paragraphs 2.4-2.6.

Site Description

The property is a detached single family dwelling located over three floors on the north eastern side of Brookfield Park close to the junction with Croftdown Road to the south.

The property is not listed but does lie within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is considered to be a positive contributor.

Relevant History

None

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

**Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy
Camden Planning Guidance 2011
NPPF - 2012**

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

- 1.1 The proposal seeks make alterations to both the front and rear elevations. At the front a new canopy will project between ground and first floor levels and the first floor front bay dropped to meet it with new bay roof also at this level.
- 1.2 At the rear, a ground floor flat roof rear extension is proposed to part infill and part project beyond the current building line, clad in zinc and with glass sliding doors across the rear elevation and the blocking up of an existing window and the creation of a door by dropping the sill on another window at ground floor level on the side elevation. At rear roof level a dormer is proposed to replace an existing cockpit roof terrace on the main roof slope.

Amendments

- 1.3 Amendments have been requested which included a reduction in the size of the overall ground floor extension footprint by 0.6 - 0.9m across the proposed rear extension and as a result of the reduction in footprint the extension has been kept at level height rather than lowered on one side. The offset stagger of the rear extension has also been amended to fall in line with the existing rhythm of the rear elevation. The ground floor roof light has been reduced in height and the proposed materials have been kept consistent across the rear extension rather than mixed. Finally the rear dormer has been made slimmer in size and the cheeks and header redesigned so that they appear less bulky.

2.0 Design

- 2.1 Camden's Design Guidance seeks that rear extensions are 'secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing; respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building as well as architectural features and wherever possible use materials that complement the colour and texture of the materials in the existing building (page 25). Furthermore, the width of rear extensions should be designed so that they are not visible from the street and should respect the rhythm of existing rear extensions, (p 28).
- 2.2 The Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement also states that rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would diverge significantly from the historic pattern of rear elevations (p56).
- 2.3 Roof alterations are also acceptable where there is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace and proposals are architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building and retain the overall integrity of the roof form; (p33-34).

The proposals include several elements covering both front and rear elevations.

Front elevation – Canopy and bay window

- 2.4 The front elevation has a ground floor bay and first floor bow window. The applicant seeks to fit a tiled canopy over the ground floor bay across the full width of the property with hipped ends and projecting 0.78m off the building. This matches other similar canopies along the street and is therefore welcomed as an alteration.
- 2.5 The first floor bow window will have an infill fitted between it and the new canopy therefore uniting these elements. There are several properties along the street which have linked bay windows (mainly on the southern side) and therefore despite the bow window being a fairly unique element of this particular building and street scene, the proposal is acceptable. This will be clad in lead which is also considered acceptable.
- 2.6 The CAAC have requested that rainwater good be metal and not plastic, which shall be requested as a detail to be discharged by condition.

Rear extension

- 2.7 The rear extension has been re-designed since the application has been submitted and are essentially two cubes each covering half the width of the rear elevation. The existing closet wing has a small outrigger at ground floor level which had a sloped roof just under the first floor window sills at 3.3m high. This will be removed and replaced with a shallow extension off the closet wing which now projects only 0.85m off the original outrigger compared to 1.45m on the original plans. This is linked to an infill extension between the closet wing and neighbouring adjoining property (No. 2) to the south east, who themselves have a large ground floor extension measuring 4.5m along this boundary.
- 2.8 The proposed infill extension would sit level with this neighbouring extension, i.e. 4.5m off the original rear elevation, compared to 5.45m on the original plans. On the northern side the neighbouring property (No. 6) sits 0.35m behind the existing outrigger and by switching which element projects further into the garden (i.e. the infill rather than the former outrigger side) the extension forms a stepped rhythm across the rear elevation at ground floor level between the deeper rear projection at No. 2 and the shallower projection at No.6.
- 2.9 As a result of the reduction in footprint, the height has been levelled at 3.1m because the projection off the rear elevation isn't as substantial as originally submitted and is therefore not considered to cause any amenity concerns to neighbouring properties because the projection beyond the neighbour at No. 6 is now only 1.15m (as opposed to 1.65m). The original outrigger measured 3.5m and therefore what is proposed is lower than this.
- 2.10 Two sets of sliding doors with metal frames are proposed for each part of the rear extension which meet centrally on the rear elevation and follow the rhythm of the rear elevation. The proposed finish of the extension is zinc which will weather in to a lighter grey than the initial darker material. This is considered to be an attractive contrast to the existing brick finish of the property, and gives a more lightweight feel to the proposed extension, something a brick finish could not have achieved.
- 2.11 The proposed extension as amended and reduced in bulk and footprint is not considered excessive and is designed to be subservient to the parent property. The proposal reads as a more lightweight structure than the outrigger that it replaces despite being full width due to the use of appropriate materials. Therefore, it is considered to comply with Camden's Design Guidance and policies DP24 and DP25 of the LDF 2010.

Green roof

- 2.12 The roof of the extension has been slimmed down slightly in order to reduce the height and bulk of this transom, and because of this a green roof was not possible to be fitted due to the need to reduce this bulk and the depth required to be able to accommodate a green roof conflicted with this. Therefore, for design purposes this is acceptable.
- 2.13 The rear rooflight on the flat roof of the extension stretches the width of the infill and has been reduced in height to 200mm which slopes gently off the rear elevation.

Decking

- 2.14 A section of decking is proposed to be fitted across part of the width of the garden immediately adjacent to the new extension, which stretches 3.5m into the rear garden. The rear garden is 15m deep and therefore this is not considered to be excessive.
- 2.15 Finally at ground floor level, a side window is proposed to be blocked up and another side window have the sill dropped to form a new door opening on the northern flank elevation adjacent to No. 6. Both of these proposals are acceptable and details will be conditioned to match existing.

Roof extension - Dormer

- 2.16 The proposed rear dormer sits within the existing footprint of the terrace area on the rear roofslope. The existing projection in the roofslope is 1.75m deep, whereas the depth of the proposed dormer is 1.5m. The dormer sits 550mm from the ridge and 900mm up from the eaves and therefore meets Camden's Design Guidance. The dormer cheeks have been slimmed down along with the header which is a welcomed enhancement to the design and is considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 2.17 Views of the proposed dormer are gained from the public realm across the rear gardens of Brookfield park from Croftdown Road to the south east. However, the dormer is not considered excessive in comparison to many others along the street and it is sandwiched between the hipped roof of the closet wing and another dormer on the neighbouring property at No. 2.

3.0 Amenity

- 3.1 Neither the proposed rear dormer, rear extension, new side door nor front elevation canopy work, is considered to cause any amenity issues. Despite the rear extension projecting further than the outrigger, the lowered height would outweigh the projection. The neighbouring property also has a small outrigger with both a side and rear window serving the same room, and therefore as the rear window is not affected by the extra projection daylight will still be in good supply to the rear room it serves.
- 3.2 The rear dormer replaces a former terrace, and therefore this is considered to cause less potential overlooking harm that could be caused from this location from the existing terrace.
- 3.3 Overall, the proposals are considered acceptable and in accordance with Council's policies DP24, DP25 and DP26 of the LDF 2010.

4.0 Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 3rd December 2012.
For further information please click [here](#).