

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	09/11/2012
Members Briefing			Consultation Expiry Date:	25/10/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Craig Raybould			2012/4510/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
35 Dartmouth Park Avenue London NW5 1JL			Refer to draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of single storey glazed rear extension at garden level to the rear, removal of concrete stairway to rear garden and installation of 3 x windows on the rear elevation at garden level, all associated with use as residential dwelling (Class C3).				
Recommendation:		Grant planning permission		
Application Type:		Resubmission of Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	06	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A press notice was printed in the Ham & High newspaper from 04/10/2012 to 25/10/2012.</p> <p>A site notice was displayed from 27/09/2012 to 18/10/2012.</p> <p><u>Summary of objections</u></p> <p><u>Occupier of Flat A, 35 Dartmouth Park Avenue</u> Object to the proposals on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extension is not in-keeping with the character of the property; • The sliding doors are not in-keeping with the period sash windows; • The extension would be visible from 4 out of 6 of the rooms in the objector's flat and would have a negative visual impact; • Suggests that a 'green roof' may be more appropriate; • The proposals would result in the removal of a mature flowering tree; • The drawings show the removal of the rear staircase to the garden. <p><u>Occupiers of Flat B, 35 Dartmouth Park Avenue</u> Object to the proposals on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extension is too wide and does not respect the canted bay; • Is of a poor design; • Will cause light pollution; • Fails to preserve or enhance the CA; • Fails to meet Dartmouth Park Energy Efficiency document; • The proposals are for economic gain (<i>not a planning consideration</i>). <p><u>Occupiers of Flat B, 33 Dartmouth Park Avenue</u> Object to the proposals on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The glazed extension is out of keeping with the main building; • The lines of the sliding doors do not align with the windows and will cause light pollution; • The proposals will require the removal of a mature tree; • The proposed plans do not include the stairway from the French windows to the garden; • The owner has already carried out internal alterations to the property (<i>the property is not listed so internal alterations to not require planning consent</i>); • The owner does not intend to use the property as his family home and has put the property on the market (<i>not a planning consideration</i>). <p>Officer's comments: The planning issues are addressed in the assessment section of this report.</p>					

**CAAC/Local groups
comments:**

The Dartmouth Park CAAC were consulted on 22/09/2012.

2 separate responses have been received from the chairman of the CAAC, objecting to the proposals on the following grounds:

- The extension is too wide and does not respect the canted bay;
- Is of a poor design;
- Will cause light pollution;
- Fails to preserve or enhance the CA;
- Fails to meet Dartmouth Park Energy Efficiency document;
- The proposals are for economic gain;
- No kitchen is proposed;
- The proposals amount to overdevelopment.

Site Description

The application site is a 5 storey semi-detached building which has been subdivided into residential flats. The property is located mid-way along Dartmouth Park Road on the western aspect, close to the junction with Bramshill Gardens. The building dates from the late nineteenth century and retains some of its Georgian features. The property benefits from generous front and rear gardens which back onto vehicular garages and the rear gardens of properties on Croftdown Road. This application relates to the flat at ground and lower ground floor level of the building.

The property is located within Sub Area 3 of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is identified as making a positive contribution to the character of the area in the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy.

Relevant History

2012/3349/P – An application for planning permission was submitted on 11/07/2012 for the erection of single storey rear extension to lower and ground floor level including installation of 2 x windows at lower ground level to the residential dwelling (Class C3). The proposals included the excavation of the lower ground floor level by a further 0.5m in depth and a full width glazed extension. The applicant requested that the application be withdrawn following discussions with the case officer. Withdrawn on 29/08/2012.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

Core Strategy

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging diversity)

Development Policies

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)

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2009)

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG1 (Design)

CPG6 (Amenity)

The London Plan (2011)

The NPPF 2012

Assessment

1. Proposals

1.1 The application proposes the erection of a fully glazed extension at garden level to the rear. The rear garden would be landscaped to level the area adjacent to the main building with the rest of the garden. The glazed extension would project 2.4m from the rear elevation of the building and would extend 7.3m across the rear elevation. The extension would be erected to a height of 2.55m from garden level with a small section at 3.1m in height where access is provided from lower ground floor level. The extension would consist of a fully glazed exterior with an internal steel structure. There would be aluminium framed glazed sliding doors to the front providing access to the rear garden. The existing means of access, provided by a stairway from the French doors of the canted bay would be removed.

Previous application: 2012/3349/P

1.2 This application has been submitted following the withdrawal of a previous scheme (2012/3349/P). The previous scheme included a larger glazed extension that extended the full width of the property and adjoined the projecting bay. The scheme also included the excavation of the entire footprint of the building by 0.5m. The applicant was advised that a glazed extension was considered acceptable in principle, but should be set in from the projecting bay to the south as this created an awkward relationship to the architectural composition of the building. The applicant chose to withdraw the application with a view to submitting a revised scheme omitting the basement level excavation and taking on board the Council's comments in respect of the glazed extension. This forms the basis of the current proposals.

1.3 The key planning considerations of the current scheme are:

- Design;
- Heritage Conservation; and
- Amenity.

2. Analysis

Design

2.1 Policies CS14 and DP24 require all new development to be of the highest standards of design. Alterations to existing buildings should respect the character and proportions of the existing building.

2.2 The application has had regard to officer comments received in respect of the previous application for a glazed extension (2012/3349/P) and consequently, the extension has been reduced in size and has been brought back away from canted bay to the south so as not to undermine the prominence of this architectural feature.

2.3 The proposed glazed extension (measuring 7.3m (l) x 2.4m (w) x 2.55m (h)) would be confined to the rear of the building and would sit at a level below the lower ground floor windows. Owing to its location and its fully glazed finish/translucent appearance, the extension would have a minimal impact on the appearance of the building.

2.4 The existing is recognised as being intrinsically modern in terms of its design. Its glazed nature juxtaposes with the main building and does not attempt to replicate any of its Georgian features. This is considered a successful design solution which sympathetically allows a modest extension that does not disturb the architectural form of historic integrity of the building.

2.5 The application proposes the removal of the existing staircase from the canted bay at lower ground floor level into the rear garden. Whilst the staircase could be considered to have some aesthetic merit, it is not an original feature of the building and its loss is not considered to be contentious.

2.6 Two new timber framed windows are proposed at garden level on the canted bay and the existing basement door would be replaced with a timber framed window in order to provide light to the existing basement. The windows match those existing on the upper floors of the building in terms of their design and form and are considered acceptable.

2.7 The proposals accords with policies CS14, DP24 and the guidance set out in CPG1: Design.

Conservation

2.8 Policy DP25 explains that within conservation areas, development will be only be permitted where

it preserves and enhances the special character of the CA.

2.9 The proposed glazed extension would be confined to the rear and would not be visible from any public views. Indeed, the only views of it would be at very oblique angles from the windows of 35b and 35a Dartmouth Park Road (the flats above) and in extremely oblique views from the upper floors on the adjoining property no. 40 Bramshill Gardens. Views from the rear of properties on Croftdown Road are distant, and are screened by mature trees, vegetation and existing garages.

2.10 Owing to the discreet location of the proposed works and their sympathetic nature to the main building, they would have a negligible visual impact and as a result are considered to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the CA, complying with policy DP25.

Amenity

2.11 Policies CS5 and DP26 seek to protect the quality of life of the Borough's residents from any harmful impacts of development taking into account visual privacy, noise, overshadowing, light pollution and general disturbance.

2.12 The proposals are not expected to cause any discernable level of overlooking into neighbouring properties, or allow for any increase in noise or disturbance over that which would be considered reasonable to the enjoyment of the dwelling.

2.13 Objectors consider that the proposals would give rise to an unacceptable level of light pollution. The proposed extension would result in a degree of light being emitted through the glazing where lights are on during the evening. Having regard to the brick boundary between the property and no. 40 Bramshill Gardens, and that the extension is set a clear storey below the first residential windows of neighbouring properties above in the building, it is not considered that the impact would have a significant affect on the amenity of neighbours.

2.14 The proposals comply with policies CS5 and DP26.

Other matters

2.15 Concerns have been raised that the proposals would result in the loss of a mature tree located next to the existing rear wall. The tree in question appears to be one that has been planted rather than self seeded and is not considered to hold any visual merit or biodiversity significance. Its removal is therefore considered to be acceptable.

2.16 Adjacent to the house, the garden slopes downwards. Where the extension would be located, this area would be levelled to match the rest of the garden resulting in the ground level being reduced by up to 90cm. This is not considered to have any discernable affect on the usability of the garden and does not amount to significant excavation works that would warrant a basemen impact assessment.

2.17 The proposed design of the extension does not lend itself to the provision of a green or brown roof, and sustainability properties are not considered contrary to those set out in the LDF and the Dartmouth Park Energy Efficiency

3. Recommendation: Grant planning permission.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 5th November 2012.
For further information please click [here](#).