

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>20/11/2012</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	08/11/2012
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Seonaid Carr			2012/5102/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
9 Chalcot Road London NW1 8LH			See draft decision notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Erection of rear first floor level extension and replacement of existing rear ground floor level window with two windows all in connection with existing residential dwellinghouse (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant conditional permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
<b>Consultations</b>						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	40	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
			No. Electronic	02		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A press notice was issued in the Ham &amp; High on 18/10/2012 (expired 08/11/2012) and a site notice was erected on 05/10/2012 (expired 26/10/2012).</p> <p>One objection has been received from a neighbouring resident at No.10 raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We thing think the extension will have a material impact on the amount of light that illuminates our home living area, specifically the kitchen room, family room and dining room;</li> <li>- We also think there may be a reduction to the already limited amount of light that reaches our garden;</li> <li>- The proposed extension will overlook the large window in our property that provides the majority of the light that reflects in to our home;</li> <li>- We suggest an independent daylight/sunlight and Rights of Light report is carried out to help determine the likely impact.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officers Comments:</b> A response to these comments will form part of the assessment below.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>The Primrose Hill CAAC were consulted on the proposal and raise the following objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposal would appear to have a harmful effect on the natural light of habitable rooms at No.10, as it is north facing, natural light will be of special value in this location and should not be diminished;</li> <li>- The proposed new windows, especially the proposed pair of windows, seem wilful and without justification in terms of the existing elevation and the established pattern in the Conservation Area.</li> </ul> <p><b>Officers Comments:</b> A response to these comments will form part of the assessment below.</p>					

## Site Description

The application site relates to a five storey mid terrace property in use as a single dwelling. The site is located to the north eastern side of Chalcot Road which is a predominantly residential area. The surrounding pattern of development is predominantly residential however there is a business village located to the rear of the site know as Utopia Village.

The application site is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and identified as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. Although the property is not listed, it is subject to an Article 4 Direction revoking most permitted development rights for the property.

## Relevant History

**2009/2852/P** - Replacement of a casement window at front basement level with a timber sash window, infill of an area adjacent to the rear basement extension and installation of sliding glazed doors opening onto the garden. Application granted planning permission.

**2004/4665/P** - Erection of a single storey rear extension at basement level under the existing terrace. Application granted planning permission.

## 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  
DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction  
DP24 Securing high quality design  
DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage  
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011 and Conservation Area Statements**

CPG1 Design  
CPG6 Amenity  
Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement

### **National Planning Policy Framework (April 2012)**

## Assessment

### Proposal

Planning permission is sought for the erection of a first floor rear extension which would be sited to the roof of the existing two storey rear addition of the property. The proposed extension would measure 2.9m wide, 3.5m deep and 2.3m in height terminating 7.45m above ground level. The extension would be a flat roof structure with a slot rooflight, the rear elevation would incorporate a timber sash window which would align with the window to the second floor level. The extension would be constructed in brickwork to match the existing dwelling.

### **Revisions:**

During the course of the application an amendment was accepted with regard to the fenestration in the rear. It was originally proposed to have two metal framed windows to the first floor level and a full height metal framed window to the second floor level of the proposed extension. These have now been amended to retain the existing window at first floor level with a sash window to the second floor level.

### Considerations

#### **1. Design**

Policies CS14 and DP24 seek to ensure all development is of the highest quality design and considers the character, setting, context and form of neighbouring buildings. Furthermore Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.

Given the proposed extension has been designed in keeping with the character of the host building, following the building lines and roof form of the existing two storey rear addition and would be constructed with materials of a similar appearance to the host property, it is considered the development would respect and preserve the original character of the building and would not cause harm to the integrity of the building.

In terms of height, given the proposed extension would be set down 5.6m from the eaves of the parent building, it would not appear unduly dominant and would respect the scale and proportion of the parent building.

With regard to fenestration, following receipt of an amendment incorporating new fenestration to the rear of the extension, it is considered that the proposed sash window to the rear of the extension would be in keeping with the fenestrational design of the parent building constituting a sympathetic addition to the dwelling that would not comprise its character.

When considering the proposed development within the context of the terrace row, there is a first floor extension to No.10 which was the subject of the previous appeal, however the Inspector dismissed the refusal on design grounds, there is also a first floor extension to No.13 and further afield at Nos. 3, 4, 5, 6 and 14. As such the proposal would not appear incongruous when viewed in the context of the wider terrace.

In light of the above it is considered that the extension would be of an appropriate design and scale to constitute an acceptable form of development that would not cause harm to the host property or the surrounding Conservation Area.

#### **2. Amenity**

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.

In respect of sunlight, the only window that would potentially be impacted by sunlight is that within the flank elevation of the three storey rear addition of No.10, as this is the sole window within 90 degree south of the proposed extension. Reviewing previously approved plans relating to an application at No.10 (Ref: 2009/0156/P) this window appears as a window to a cloak room, a non-habitable room and as such would not cause significant harm to the amenity enjoyed by these occupiers, although the use of this room may have changed it is unlikely it would now form an individual habitable room given its limited size(2.36sq.m).

In terms of daylight, with regard to No.8 given the siting of the extension in relation to the nearest habitable window which would be some 3.7m from the proposed extension the development is unlikely to impact

significant on the levels of daylight received by this neighbour. In respect of No.10, when undertaking the BRE 45 degree in relation of the double doors located to the rear of the living room at No.10, the development would result in a loss of daylight to this room, however the level of daylight received into this room is already impacted in the existing situation due to the existing height of the two storey rear addition to the application site, No.9 and the three storey rear addition present at No.10. Therefore it is considered that the proposed development would not result in significantly less daylight received into this room. It is also important to note that this rear opening is not the sole opening for this room, there is another window to the front elevation. As such it is likely the room would receive a sufficient level of daylight as not to detrimentally harm the amenity of the occupiers.

When considering the daylight and sunlight implications of this proposal it is important to note that when planning permission was submitted retrospectively for the first floor extension to No.10 (Ref: 2009/0156/P) a daylight and sunlight report accompanied the application, as amenity issues formed a reason for refusal on a previous application at the property which was also the subsequent reason for dismissing the appeal. Within this report it was demonstrated that the first floor extension, which is the same as what is being proposed within this application, would not cause harm to the levels of daylight and sunlight received into the neighbouring properties. Given the situation is largely the same as that of this current application it is not considered unreasonable to accept that the development would not impact detrimentally on levels of sunlight and daylight received into neighbouring properties. Furthermore it is considered that it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on grounds of amenity when the Council have previously approved a very similar scheme at the neighbouring property.

With regard to overlooking, an adjoining neighbour has raised concern that the proposal would overlook a large window that provides the majority of the light into their property. However the only window to the first floor extension would be to the rear elevation facing the rear garden area of the application site. It is considered that the proposed extension would not increase the opportunity to overlook neighbouring properties anymore than is already possible via the existing windows.

### **Conclusion**

It is concluded that the proposed works would be an acceptable form of development that would accord with the relevant policies of the Local Development Framework and in this regard no objection is raised.

### **Recommendation:**

**Grant condition permission**

### **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> November 2012.**

**For further information see**

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>