

|  |                            |                           |                                     |            |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|
| <b>Delegated Report</b><br>(Members' Briefing)   |                            | <b>Analysis sheet</b>     | <b>Expiry Date:</b>                 | 18/06/2012 |
|  |                            | N/A / attached            | <b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>    | 31/5/2012  |
| <b>Officer</b>   |                            |                           | <b>Application Number(s)</b>        |            |
| John Nicholls  |                            |                           | 2012/2177/P                         |            |
| <b>Application Address</b>   |                            |                           | <b>Drawing Numbers</b>              |            |
| 15 Belsize Park<br>LONDON<br>NW3 4ES   |                            |                           | See 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>   |                            |                           |                                     |            |
| Addition of a new balcony to rear elevation to ground floor residential flat (Class C3). |                            |                           |                                     |            |
| <b>Recommendation(s):</b>  |                            | Grant Planning Permission |                                     |            |
| <b>Application Type:</b>   |                            | Full Planning Permission  |                                     |            |

|   |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b> | Refer to Draft Decision Notice |
| <b>Informatives:</b>                      |                                |

### Consultations

|                             |              |           |                  |           |                   |           |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| <b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b> | No. notified | <b>23</b> | No. of responses | <b>03</b> | No. of objections | <b>01</b> |
|                             |              |           | No. electronic   | <b>00</b> |                   |           |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Summary of consultation responses:</b> | <p>A site notice was displayed on 3/5/2012 and a press notice on 10/5/2012. There have been two letters of support and one letter of objection. These are summarised as follows:</p> <p><u>Support</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed works appear to be a tasteful restoration of a long lost balcony and that it isn't being extended onto the lower ground floor brick extension.</li> <li>It helps improve the overall property and it will be aesthetically and sensitively done.</li> </ul> <p><u>Objection</u><br/><u>Amenity - daylight/sunlight</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised over the cumulative impact of the extension, the balcony and its supporting buttresses on potential reduction to daylight and sunlight levels in the lower ground floor room. See paragraphs 3.1 - 3.5.</li> <li><u>Overlooking</u> - The balcony would enable a view into the rear bedroom extension. See paragraphs 3.6 – 3.7.</li> <li><u>Privacy</u> – The proposed balcony above the patio below would lead to a loss of privacy, with a balcony no more than a few feet above the lower ground floor outdoor living space. See paragraph 3.8.</li> <li><u>Sense of enclosure</u> – The high adjoining wall to the west side of the patio already increases the sense of enclosure and an overhead balcony will exacerbate this issue. See paragraphs 3.4 - 3.5.</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

|  |                                   |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| <b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b><br>*Please Specify | No comment from the Belsize CAAC. |
|--|-----------------------------------|

### Site Description

The property concerned is the upper ground floor flat of 4 storey property located mid terrace on the south eastern side of Belsize Park.

The property is made up of a number of flats and is located within the Belsize Park Conservation Area. The property is not listed.

### Relevant History

PW9802670 - The reinstatement of an original balcony to surround an existing bay at rear ground floor level – Granted - 22/10/1998

PW9802862R1 - Erection of a single storey rear extension to an existing flat at ground floor level –

Granted - 24/05/1999.

## **Relevant policies**

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Belsize Park Conservation Area Appraisal

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

## **Assessment**

### **1.0 Proposal**

1.1 The proposal involves the removal of a Juliet balcony railing and the re-instatement of a balcony at rear upper ground floor level on the rear elevation bay window.

### **2.0 Design**

2.1 The design of the balcony bay matches those on adjoining properties which have not been removed in the past. The depth is 700mm and made of steel with a GRP (stone effect fibreglass) covering underneath and the top surface finished with stone tiles. The railings would match the size and design of the adjoining neighbouring railings and will be painted black metal. The Council welcomes the reinstatement of the original ironwork and considers this to both preserve and enhance the Belsize Conservation Area in compliance with design policies.

### **3.0 Amenity**

#### Sunlight / daylight / sense of enclosure

3.1 The Council received an objection over the loss of sunlight/daylight to the lower ground floor living room immediately below the ground floor flat.

3.2 At lower ground floor level a small extension was approved in 1998 and subsequently implemented. This creates a 3.4m high extension off the flat part of the rear elevation adjacent to the round bay window. There is a concern that the proposal alongside the cumulative impact of the extension would lead to a loss of sunlight and daylight to the lower ground floor rooms.

3.3 However, the balcony will only create a small shadow across the window and it is not considered that it would lead to any significant loss of sunlight and daylight inside the room any more than already exists which is created by the lower ground floor rear extension.

3.4 A concern has been raised over the cumulative impact that could be caused by the balcony being erected alongside the existing extension and existing high party wall which rises to at least 5m adjacent to the property and prevents overlooking between the bay windows at upper ground floor level on the semi-detached pair.

3.5 Although there may be a slight increase in the sense of enclosure with the new balcony addition, it is not considered to cause significant enough amenity harm to warrant refusal.

## Overlooking

- 3.6 Since the original balcony was removed, permission has been granted for a small lower ground floor extension with a flank set of French doors on the flank elevation, which is used as a bedroom. The as existing situation means that there are already views from the Juliet balcony into this bedroom, which are oblique and would result in views of a same section of the floor.
- 3.7 The proposed balcony would project out from the upper ground floor by 0.7m. Given the fact that the views remain oblique and would not be materially worse than the existing situation, no objection is raised
- 3.8 The as existing situation has a Juliet balcony railing set within the window reveal of the set of French doors at the rear of the property at upper ground floor level. It is considered that privacy concerns would be only marginally greater than those that already exist between a Juliet balcony and a full but narrow balcony.

**Recommendation:** Grant Planning Permission

## **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> June 2012. For further information please click [here](#).