

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	24/07/2012
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	05/07/2012
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>		
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2012/2608/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
39 Mornington Crescent London NW1 7RB			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</b>					
Erection of a single storey rear extension at lower ground floor level (following demolition of existing single-storey extension) and excavation of rear garden in connection with existing residential dwelling (Class C3).					
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Grant planning permission subject to conditions			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>	<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>						
<b>Consultations</b>						
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>	No. notified	<b>06</b>	No. of responses	<b>00</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
			No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>	<p>A site notice was displayed from 08/06/2012 to 29/06/2012. A press notice was advertised on 14/06/2012 and expired on 05/07/2012.</p> <p>One letter of objection has been received from the owner of 41A Mornington Crescent raising concerns about the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed ground floor extension would be some 1m higher than single storey extensions which have been permitted previously in this area. It therefore would set an unwelcome precedent and harm the character of the existing properties.</li> <li>The proposed upper storey would overall project 1680mm across the full width of the property.</li> <li>No drawings are provided showing the aspect on the other side of no 38.</li> <li>The height of protrusion of the proposed upper storey extension will adversely affect neighbours' right to light.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report.</i></p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	<p>The Camden Town CAAC strongly objected to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed extension would be out of scale with the rear of this small property and the neighbouring terrace properties, dating from 1810 to 1820. The application property and its neighbours are considered to be positive building in the Conservation Area's Appraisal.</li> <li>The proposed extension is the overdevelopment of the open space at the rear of the houses and would involve loss of original floor plan.</li> <li>The proposal would truncate the tall stair window that is an original, characteristic feature of these houses. This would detract from the appearance of the conservation area.</li> <li>The proposed largely rendered areas and timber cladding would be inappropriate and detract from the appearance of the terrace and the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response: Please refer to the assessment part of the report.</i></p>					
<b>Site Description</b>						
<p>The application site is a three storey plus semi-basement level mid terrace property on the north side of Mornington Crescent close to the junction between Mornington Crescent and Arlington Road in the Camden Town Conservation Area. The property is a single family dwellinghouse and is identified as a positive contributor to the appearance and character of the conservation area.</p>						
<b>Relevant History</b>						
None						

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### Core Strategy

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

#### Development Policies

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

#### Camden Planning Guidance 2011

CPG 1 - Design

CPG 6 - Amenity

### Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal

## Assessment

#### Original Proposal

The application was originally submitted for the erection of a 2-storey rear extension at lower and upper ground floor levels (following demolition of the existing single-storey extension). Following the officer's concerns relating to the impact of the proposed upper ground floor on the appearance and character of the host building and the rest of the terrace the applicants omitted the upper ground floor element of the proposed extension from the proposal.

#### Current Proposal

The current proposal is for the erection of a single storey rear extension involving demolition of the existing rear extension and excavation of the rear garden space by approximately 1.2m. The proposed rear extension would add a floorspace of 13.5sqm to the existing house.

#### Design and Appearance

The existing rear extension is in a poor state of repair and covers slightly less than half of the width of the house. The proposed rear extension would be full width and project between 3.7m and 4m from the rear of the house into the rear garden. The height of the extension would not exceed the height of the existing boundary walls on either side. The proposed extension would have a modern appearance with large patio doors and white rendering.

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG1) for rear extensions advises that they should be secondary to the building being extended and allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden space. In terms of width the guidance states that the rear extensions should be designed not to be visible from the street and respect the rhythm of the existing rear extensions.

The existing rear garden is paved up to the planting strip at the rear and does not have any vegetation with amenity value. The proposal would retain more than half of the rear garden space and would not compromise the garden settings of this terrace of properties.

The rear elevation of the application property together with the adjoining properties above the lower ground floor level is visible from oblique angles from Arlington Road. The proposed rear extension would be mainly screened by the existing side site boundary walls and would not be readily visible from the streetscene. In terms of location, form, scale, proportions and dimensions the proposed extension is considered subordinate to the existing building and would respect and preserve the character of the existing building and the wider conservation area.

#### Neighbouring Amenity:

Due to the height and size of the proposed extension, the proposal is unlikely to significantly harm the amenities of the adjoining properties in terms of loss of outlook and privacy.

The nearest windows in the neighbouring properties at no. 38 are located approximately 1.6m from the boundary of the site and 0.5m from no. 40. Although the neighbouring properties were not accessed during the site visit it is considered that the internal layouts of the buildings would be similar to the application site. The existing boundary wall and single storey extension to the application building currently restrict daylight to the windows of the neighbouring properties at lower ground floor level. The upper ground floor window in no. 40 nearest to the application site appears to serve a stairwell. The proposal would therefore not be considered to harm the amenity of this property in terms of daylight. It is not clear what room the upper ground floor window serves at no. 38. However given its location in relation to the application site (approximately 1.6m), the proposal would not be considered to harm the daylight that would be received to this room and would be considered acceptable.

The proposal would include a rooflight that would be adjacent to the main rear elevation of the building. It would measure 3.4m (width) by 0.8m (length). Due to the size of the rooflight it is considered that it would be possible to gain oblique views to the upper floor windows of the neighbouring properties and would therefore be considered acceptable.

**Other concerns:** Given the proposal would not increase the residential floor space more than 100sqm CIL is not applicable in this case.

Given the small amount of excavation and the fact that Mornington Crescent is not identified to be at risk of surface water flooding a Basement Impact Assessment is not considered to be necessary in this case.

**Conclusion:** The proposal is considered not to harm the appearance and character of the host building and the conservation area and amenities of the neighbouring properties.

**Recommendation:** Grant conditional permission.

#### DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2012. For further information please click [here](#).