

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	07/05/2012
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	19/04/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Lauren McMahon			2012/1589/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
26 Oakeshott Avenue London N6 6NS			Refer to draft decision notice.		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Renewal of permission granted on 27/04/2009 for the erection of a single-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension to the dwelling-house (ref 2009/0823/P).					
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission			
Application Type:		Renewal of Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	03	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	The application was advertised in the local press – Ham & High 29/03/2012 - 19/04/2012. A site notice was displayed 22/03/2012 - 12/04/2012.					
	An objection has been received from the occupier of no. 28 Oakeshott Avenue, raising concerns about the loss of outlook, views of Hampstead Heath and sunlight and the increase of sense of enclosure. The adjoining neighbour was concerned that the proposal would be contrary to the Holly Lodge Estate draft Conservation Area Statement 2001 and raised the following objections:					
	Single-storey rear extension					
	The objector has raised concerns that the rear extension would be contrary to:					
	<p>HL20 Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced. Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the Conservation Area. In most cases such extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but its general effect on neighbour properties and Conservation area will be the basis of its suitability.</p> <p>HL21 Extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house, and the historic pattern of extensions within the group of buildings. The acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances.</p>					
	The neighbouring occupier considers the proposal would fail on three accounts:					
	<div>1) A full width extension alters the balance and harmony, and is dominant to the host building.</div> <div>2) The general effect on neighbouring properties in terms of outlook, sense of enclosure and loss of evening sunlight is unacceptable, and this is the criteria on which the suitability of extensions will be based.</div> <div>3) A full width extension to the depth indicated would be termed a larger extension, and in this particular context is unsympathetic to the adjoining neighbours and the conservation area.</div>					
	<u>Officer response</u>					
	Design of single-storey rear extension					
	The design of the single-storey rear extension was considered appropriate when previously assessed as part of the planning application 2009/0823/P (please see ‘relevant history’ section below). Although the scheme proposes a full width extension, it is considered appropriate in this case as the extension would not be visible from the streetscene and is completely obscured from the public realm. It is considered subordinate to the overall size of the house in bulk and height and is one storey below eaves level and no wider than the main house. Also similar extensions are a common feature in the Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area, therefore it would be difficult to argue that this proposal would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding Conservation Area.					
	Amenity of single-storey rear extension					
	The impact upon the amenity of the surrounding neighbours has been previously assessed as part of the planning application 2009/0823/P and was not caused to result in a loss of amenity which would lead to a sustainable reason for refusal of the application on this basis. Further to this assessment, the proposed rear extension would not create a significant					

	<p>sense of enclosure to no. 28 given the extension would be setback 1.2m from the side (east) boundary and the ground level of no. 28 is slightly higher than the subject site. The rear extension would result in a minor loss of view to Hampstead Heath and would partially obstruct the outlook from no. 28. However the view loss and loss of outlook is not significant enough to cause concern and furthermore no. 28 will still enjoy views onto their large rear garden. Moreover CPG6 paragraph 7.11 states that “the specific view from a property is not protected as this is not a material planning consideration”. The rear extension would result in a minor loss of afternoon sunlight to the patio of no. 28; however given the extension is setback from the side boundary and is of a reasonable height (3.3m) it is not considered to be significant enough to result in a sustainable reason for refusal.</p> <p>Single-storey side extension</p> <p>The objector has raised concerns that the side extension would be contrary to:</p> <p><i>HL32 Normally the in-filling of gaps between buildings will be resisted where an important gap is compromised or the symmetry of the composition of a building would be impaired.</i></p> <p>The objector is concerned that a number of gaps between the buildings have in the past been in-filled. However the houses were all originally developed as semi detached properties. In the light of the new conservation area statement it is thought inappropriate that further gaps are infilled which would lead to the Holly Lodge estate losing its character as semi detached properties, and over time evolving to have the appearance of a continual terrace.</p> <p><i>Officer response: First, to clarify, the Holly Lodge Estate draft Conservation Area Statement 2001 was considered within the previous application 2009/0823/P and there have been no amendments to the statement in the intervening period. Furthermore, the infilling of the gap was considered as part of the previous application which concluded that given the proposed side extension is significantly set back from the front elevation and is single storey; it is not considered that this element of the application would have a detrimental effect on the streetscene or the wider Conservation Area. Therefore the side extension and the infilling of the gap is considered appropriate in this regard.</i></p>
<p>CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify</p>	<p>Holly Lodge CAAC was formally consulted but no response was received.</p>

Site Description

A 2-storey semi-detached house situated on the south side of Oakeshott Avenue with a gap between no. 28. The property is sited close to the front boundary of the plot and has a large rear garden. Most of the properties west of the host building have single-storey rear extensions which vary in detailed design, size, depth, height and roof form (flat roof gable and mono-pitched). Similarly single-storey side extensions are characteristic of properties on south side at nos. 16-26 and on the north side at nos. 11, 13 and 15. The property is located within Holly Lodge Estate Conservation Area. It is not listed.

Relevant History

13/03/2008 planning permission was refused for the erection of a single-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension (ref 2007/6365/P) as the proposed extension, by reason of its design, height and depth, would be an unsympathetic and dominant feature which would detract from the appearance of the host building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

23/04/2009 planning permission was granted for the erection of a single-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension (ref 2009/0823/P).

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS13 - Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

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

Holly Lodge Estate draft Conservation Area Statement 2011

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

NPPF

Assessment

1.0 Overview

- 1.1 This application is for the renewal of planning permission (ref 2009/0823/P) which was granted on 27/04/2009 (and expires 27/04/2012) for the erection of a single-storey side extension and a single-storey rear extension. The current application does not propose any alterations to the scheme already permitted.
- 1.2 Communities and Local Government Guidance for extensions to the time limits for implementing planning permission advises that the development proposed in an application for extension will, by definition, have been judged to be acceptable at an earlier date. Therefore the planning authority should only focus their attention on development plan policies and other material considerations which may have changed significantly since the original grant of permission.

2.0 Development Plan policies

- 2.1 The original application was assessed against policies in the 2006 Unitary Development Plan, which was replaced by the Local Development Framework, adopted in November 2010. In respect of this application and the primary considerations of it (design / impact on conservation area / amenity) there has not been a material change in the approach taken in the Core Strategy and Development Policies compared to the UDP that would materially alter the assessment of the proposals.
- 2.2 CPG section 4 has come into force since the previous application was submitted which requires that at least 10% of the project cost should be spent on improvements to the energy efficiency rating of a building that is subject to a change of use. A sustainability statement has been submitted with the application which outlines the improvements to be undertaken to the host building to reduce energy consumption. Measurements such as insulation to walls, floors and roof areas and the upgrading of the existing windows/doors would improve the energy consumption of the host building and would reach the 10% target.

3.0 Other material considerations

- 3.1 A planning history search (see '*relevant history*' above) and site inspection has revealed that there have been no significant material changes on or adjacent to the site since the granting of the original permission which would affect the positive determination of the application.

4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 It is considered that there have been no significant material changes either in policy objectives or in site circumstances since the granting of the original permission which would affect the positive determination of the application. The conditions attached to the original permission are still considered to be relevant and are recommended to be applied to the current application. Since the original permission a further standard condition in relation to non-material and minor material amendments is now added to applications of this nature. Such a condition is recommended to be added to this scheme.

5.1 Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 30th April 2012. For further information see

<http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-built-environment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/>