

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>04/09/2012</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	3/8/2012
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Hugh Miller			2012/3604/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
20 Woodsome Road London NW5 1RY			See draft decision		
<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 a single-storey and two storey rear extensions plus chimney following the demolition of existing rear extension, new associated roof terrace with glass balustrade and replacement of existing window with french doors at first floor level; rebuild existing front bay at ground floor level and associated works and repairs including the addition of metal railings to front boundary wall to single dwelling (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	09	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Application advertised 26/7/2012, expires 16/8/2012. Site Notice displayed 18/7/2012, expires 8/8/2012.</p> <p><u>22 Woodsome Rd:</u> We object to the application to add an additional extension to the rear of the second floor of the current building. The current structure has an extension at the rear at ground and first level only. This second floor extension is not in keeping with the appearance of the conservation area. The additional structure would block light from the rear of our home, especially on the first and second floors. The extension would block our view from the third floor. As our home is north facing, lack of light is a real issue that would be made significantly worse by the unnecessary second floor (third story) extension.</p> <p><u>Occupier of 22 Woodsome Rd.</u> withdraw objection following the removal of the third floor rear extension via email dated 30<sup>th</sup> August 2012.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments:	<p><u>Dartmouth Park CAAC: Objection</u></p> <p>1. The rear of this house is clearly visible from the public highway, and the Conservation Area Appraisal stresses the importance of rear views. (<i>The 3<sup>rd</sup> floor extension has been omitted from the scheme. Some limited private views are available to occupiers opposite</i>).</p> <p>2. The side infill extension should, in accordance with Camden Planning Guidance: Design, 4.10, "be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing." The proposal clearly conflicts with this policy, as the ground floor infill is as deep as the main wing and is made indistinguishable in form and details from that wing, which is itself to be altered. The character of the recessed first floor is completely changed by substituting large glazed double doors for the window. (<i>Please see paras 3.1-3.3 below. The 3<sup>rd</sup> floor extension has been omitted from the scheme</i>).</p> <p>3. The proposed bi-fold glazed doors across the whole of the rear of the ground floor are inappropriate for the character of the building and will not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. (<i>Please see paras 3.1-3.3 below</i>)</p> <p>4. The proposed alterations by way of infill, together with the alterations to the existing wing by building an additional storey would damage the integrity of the rear of this terrace. Camden Policy Guidance: Design at 4.13 states that extensions' higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet (as here) will be strongly discouraged. The addition to No.18 was made before the creation of the Conservation Area, and cannot be quoted as a precedent. (<i>Please see paras 3.1-3.3 below. The 3<sup>rd</sup> floor extension has been omitted from the scheme</i>).</p> <p>5. The removal of the rear chimney with its pots is destructive of a defining characteristic of this terrace, and will harm the Conservation Area. (<i>Please see paras 3.1-3.3 below. The chimney will be retained as part of the revised scheme</i>).</p> <p>6. The creation of a roof terrace is objectionable. (<i>Please see paras 4.1-4.4 below</i>)</p>					

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>7. The Conservation Area Appraisal &amp; Statement lays down that rear extensions "will not be acceptable where they diverge significantly from the historic pattern", as these proposals do. (<i>Please see paras 3.1-3.3 below</i>).</p> <p>8. At the front elevation it is not specified that the railings should correspond with those in the neighbouring properties, i.e., substantial iron railings of a particular pattern set into the coping stone of the dwarf wall. (<i>See para. 3.4 below. Proposed railings would match no.22 and others opposite</i>)</p> <p>9. Nor is it specified that the windows are to be timber-framed, with 'horns', as should be required. (<i>Drawings are annotated &amp; DAS state re-built bay window to match existing</i>)</p> <p>10. The removal of the rear ground floor walls and west side wall of the wing will reduce the energy efficiency of the house, in conflict with Camden Planning Guidance: Sustainability, 4, Key messages, and 4.3. (<i>New build insulated walls also roof to current standard is considered an improvement on energy efficiency.</i>)</p> |
|--|---|

## Site Description

A mid-terraced family dwellinghouse located on the north-west side of Woodsome Road, west of the junction with Boscastle Road and south east of Croftdown Road. The building is currently vacant and in a poor state of disrepair. The building is within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The building is not listed but makes a positive contribution to the CA.

## Relevant History

December 2011 – **PP Refused** - Conversion from single dwelling house and formation of three self-contained flats (comprising 1x1bed and 2x2bed), including erection of 2-storey infill extension at rear and associated alterations to windows and doors on rear elevation (Class C3, ref. 2011/5321/P) as follows:

1. The proposed two-storey rear extension would, by reason of its detailed design, bulk, scale and siting, dominate the host building and would be an incongruous and over dominant addition, resulting in an unacceptable form of development, detrimental to the appearance of the host building, the terrace of which it is a part and the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.
2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.
3. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing necessary repaving works to the highway, would fail to secure adequate provision for and safety of pedestrians

September 2011 - Withdrawn PP - Conversion of single family dwelling to create 2x1bed and 2x2bed residential flats including proposed rear extension at ground, first and second floors (Class C3); ref. 2011/3614/P.

### 16 Woodsome Road

August 1985 – Granted PP - Erection of a rear extension at 2nd floor level; Revised on 24th July 1985; ref. PL/8500953/R1.

### 18 Woodsome Road

November 1988 – Granted PP - Erection of a single storey rear extension to the existing ground floor flat; ref. 8802286.

### 22 Woodsome Road

May 2003 - Refused PP - Erection of an additional storey to a two-storey rear extension; ref. PEX0300244.

## Relevant policies

### **LDF Core Strategy and**

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

### **Development Policies**

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

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

### **CPG 2011.**

CPG1

## National Planning Policy Framework 2012

### Assessment

#### 1.0 Overview

1.1 As noted in the history section above, a recent scheme for conversion of the property into self-contained flats including part single-storey part 3-storey rear extension was refused planning permission. This proposal is for rear extensions and large family residential dwellinghouse.

#### Original Proposal

1.2 2012/3640/P - Erection of a single storey and 3- storey rear extensions following the demolition of existing rear extension and associated roof terrace with glass balustrade and replacement of existing window with french doors at first floor level; replacement of existing front bay at ground floor level and associated works and repairs including the addition of metal railings to front boundary wall to single dwelling (Class C3).

#### 2.0 Revised Proposal

- ✓ Erection of single-storey infill rear extension including roof terrace and glazed balustrade;
- ✓ Replacement of 2- storey rear extension plus chimney following the demolition of existing rear extension;
- ✓ Replacement of existing window with french doors at first floor level rear;
- ✓ Replacement of existing front bay window at ground floor level and associated works and repairs including;
- ✓ Addition of metal railings to front boundary wall.

NB: Associated Proposal: 2012/3715/P - Erection of dormer extension to rear roofslope including installation of 2 x rooflight and replacement of timber frame windows with double glazes windows at all level to front and rear elevation (Class C3). Decision pending.

#### 3.0 Design and appearance

3.1 The revised proposal comprises the erection of a 2-storey rear extension including the associated chimney. The proposed replacement extension would be of identical height and footprint as the existing rear closet wing excluding the single-storey mono pitch extension. The single-storey infill rear extension would form a full-width extension at the ground level. It would occupy the recessed area adjacent to the flank wall of no.18 Woodsome Road (4.7m height). It would include full-height aluminium powder coated bi-folding doors, which would provide a light-weight appearance that both minimise visual and actual bulk. Moreover, infill extensions are characteristic of the neighbouring houses with varying finishes of either brick and or timber. The proposed infill extension would include matching brickwork finish and it would align with the depth of the 2-storey closet wing. The remainder of the rear extension would comprise timber framed sash windows to match existing, slated mono-pitch roof including a single conservation/heritage rooflight. In his location the proposal is considered subordinate to the host building and is acceptable.

3.2 At first floor level rear, a roof terrace including an in-set rooflight plus glazed balustrade are proposed and is conveniently located behind the side flank wall with no.18. It is proposed to install French timber framed glazed doors as replacement for the sash window to provide access to the roof terrace. The French doors would have a marginal increase in width, which in this location is considered satisfactory being obscure from the public realm and is largely obscure from the private views of occupiers that lies due north of the host building. The increase in opening is not considered so significant to harm the appearance of the host building. The alterations to the first rear windows are considered minor and would integrate well with the refurbished extension and architectural

composition of the building.

**3.3** It is considered that these alterations would not affect the overall appearance of the building. The proposal is therefore considered to preserve the character and appearance of the host building and the conservation area in accordance with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25.

#### Front elevation

**3.4** The current bay-window is in a poor state of repair and requires immediate attention. The proposal is to rebuild the bay to match the existing. The proposals also include repairing the existing rendered dwarf wall and adding some metal railings. The proposed new railing will be painted black to match the other railings along the street (nos.22, 1b-9) and is considered to be in keeping with the streetscene and is satisfactory.

#### **4.0 Amenity**

**4.1** Roof terraces at first floor rear are not characteristic of the houses at nos.14-30 Woodsome Road unlike neighbouring houses due north, 14-24 Croftdown Road. The proposed roof terrace would be approximately 20m from the properties fronting Croftdown Road, which is considered substantial enough to ensure there would not be any significant loss of privacy or overlooking to these neighbours. Additionally, there are large mature trees located between the two groups of terraces which partially screen views from both sets of occupiers.

**4.2** The proposed roof terrace would be of matching depth of the existing closet wing (4.7m) and also the depth of the flank wall of no.18 on the west side. The high brick boundary wall with no.18 would ensure no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur to the occupiers of this property.

**4.3** In this location, it is considered that no significant additional noise nuisance would occur and the roof terrace is acceptable.

**4.4** With no height increase to the closet wing, no harm would be caused to neighbouring occupiers in terms of loss of day/sunlight, outlook or views and the proposal is satisfactory. On amenity grounds the proposal is compliant with CPG guidelines and LDF DP26.

**Recommendation:** Grant planning permission.

#### **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 10<sup>th</sup> September 2012.  
For further information please click [here](#).