

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		20/09/2012	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		27/8/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Hugh Miller				2012/3504/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
29 Agincourt Road London NW3 2PA				See draft decision			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a single storey flat roof rear extension to ground floor flat (Class C3)							
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	08	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
				No. electronic	02		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>Application advertised in Ham & High 16/8/2012, expired 6/9/2012. Site Notice displayed 9/8/2012, expired 30/8/2012.</p> <p><u>31a Agincourt Road (ground floor):</u> Objection</p> <p>1) The size and bulk of the existing extension is very large and extending the existing extension to the party wall with 31a would be detrimental to the local amenity of the site. Due to the stepped down nature of the site relative to the neighbouring property (31) the size and bulk of the proposed extension would be further amplified and loss of amenity would be significant. <i>(Please see paras. 3.1-3.2 & 4.1 below)</i></p> <p>2) Due to the height and bulk of the proposed extension there will also be significant a loss of natural light to the neighbouring property of 31a Agincourt Road. The drawings provided, do not show the relative impact. The proposed lightwell is insufficient in size. As the neighbouring property (31) is approximately 3-4 feet lower than 29, thus the proposed infill brick extension, would obstruct a significant amount of natural daylight into the neighbouring flat. Using the parking area on the Cressy Road side of the plot would not impact light or privacy for neighbouring properties. <i>(Please see paras. 3.1-3.2 & 4.1 below)</i></p>					

	<p>3) The size of the proposed infill would also be visible from Cressy Road and have a detrimental affect on the visual amenity of the conservation area. <i>(Please see paras. 3.1-3.2 below)</i></p> <p>4) The proposed building materials are also not in keeping with the local conservation area as the material proposed is not traditional London stock. <i>(Please see paras. 3.1-3.2 below)</i></p> <p>5) There is also a concern that the roof of the new extension, given the proposed design and building materials, it would be accessible from the upstairs flat of 29 Agincourt Road for use as a roof terrace which would severely impact on the privacy of both 31a and 31b Agincourt Road. The proposed roof of the new extension is approximately 1-2 feet lower than the base of the 1st floor windows which, if used as a roof terrace even illegally, would remove all privacy. <i>(Please see paras. 3.1-3.2; & para. 4.1 below)</i></p> <p><u>31 Agincourt Road (upper floors): Comment & Objection</u></p> <p>1) Unfortunately the plans are not very clear, and the application not very detailed. <i>(The submitted drawings provide acceptable comparison with the extant approved drawings and are clear)</i></p> <p>2) We didn't object to the last preceding application because it proposed an extension that sloped down from the high point of the top of the current extension to (I believe) a point below the top of the (high) fence that separates 29 and 31. <i>(Please see paras. 3.1-3.2 below)</i></p> <p>3) The current extension (before the proposed addition) is large - long but above all high. It looks like this application continues the original extension at its original height (or increasing because of any slope) right across to the boundary? If it does we don't think that's appropriate. <i>(Please see paras. 3.1-3.2 below)</i></p>
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<u>Mansfield CAAC</u> : No Objection.

Site Description

The application relates to the ground floor flat of a three store late Victorian end of terrace house with two other flats on the upper floors. The site relates to a corner plot which fronts Agincourt Road and has a side elevation on Cressy Road. The building is at a higher level then neighbouring properties. The property is not a listed building but is located within the Mansfield Conservation Area.

Relevant History

April 2011 – PP Granted - Erection of a single-storey rear extension at ground floor level to existing ground floor flat (Class C3); ref. 2011/0710/P.

February 2012 – Refused - Erection of a single storey ground floor infill rear extension to residential flat (Class C3); ref. 2011/5904/P.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy

CS1 (Distribution of Growth –make best use of limited land);

CS5 (Manage impact of growth);

CS14 (Promote high quality places and conserve our heritage)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design);

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 The erection of a single storey flat roof rear extension to ground floor flat with dimensions of approximately 3.3m in height, 4.7m length and 2.5m width. The design leaves a courtyard/lightwell at the front part of the side passage meaning that light to the existing rooms is not restricted.

1.2 As noted in the history section above, the Council has previously granted planning permission for a single-storey rear extension with a timber barrel-vault with stainless-steel metal cladding barrel shaped roof at the application site. At the time of the site visit the extant approved scheme was not implemented. The next door property at no. 31 has recently been extended with a barrel-vaulted extension running across the back garden.

3.0 Design & appearance

3.1 There is an existing single-storey rear closet wing with flat roof and raised parapet. The proposed single-storey rear extension would occupy a section of the side patio area in between this extension and the boundary with no.31. The rear garden to the host building is higher than no.31. The key differences between the extant approved scheme and the current proposal are as follows:

- The proposal is for a flat roof plus raised brick parapet roof instead of a barrel-vault shaped roof;
- The proposal approximately 0.5m taller than the approved extension and will be the same height as the existing adjacent single store rear extension.
- The proposed extension is to be set back and will now align with the rear elevation of the existing single-storey closet wing (the approved scheme projected from the rear elevation);
- The lightwell/ inner courtyard floorspace between the main host building and the new extension would be reduce in size;
- The extension has a larger footprint that that approved;
- A section of the rear elevation is curved to match the existing closet wing.

3.2 The above changes to the proposal would ensure that the proposed would remain subordinate to the main host building in terms of its design, scale and proportion. Matching brick, painted timber framed windows and doors would match the existing which is similar to the extant scheme and thus the use of materials and execution is acceptable. The proposed extension would therefore not harm the appearance of the host building or harm the character or the appearance of the conservation area. It is therefore in keeping with LDF policies DP24 and DP25.

4.0 Amenity

4.1. The proposed extension including flat roof is therefore considered acceptable because:

- a. The rear windows to both the host building and no.31 are orientated due north and there will be no impact from the extension on the sunlight levels at the adjacent property.
- b. The adjacent property at no. 31 has an existing full width extension, with a similar size lightwell/courtyard and a longer projection than the proposed extension. There is therefore not considered to be any impact on the daylight levels at the adjacent property from the increased height.
- c. The proposed extension would not be visible from the public realm (on Cressy Road); it being of identical height with its rear elevation aligning with the existing extension.
- d. The flat roof of the proposed extension is not directly accessible from a 1st floor window whereas the existing closet wing flat roof can be accessed from the 1st floor rear window. Nevertheless, a condition could be attached to inform occupiers to avoid using the proposed flat roof as a roof terrace.
- e. The property would retain a rear amenity space of a satisfactory size.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission.

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444