

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		13/04/2012	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		05/04/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Rob Tulloch				2012/0588/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
38 Woodsome Road London NW5 1RZ				Please see decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Amendment to planning permission (ref: 2010/3338/P) granted 23/08/2010 (for erection of rear dormer roof extension, reconfiguration of existing first floor rear extension including installation of Juliette balcony, erection of garden storage area and associated alterations to single dwelling house (Class C3)) involving amendments to height, width and fenestration of first floor rear extension.							
Recommendation(s):		Refuse Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	14	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	03
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>A site notice was erected on 29/02/2012, expiring on 21/03/2012. An advert was placed in the Ham and High on 15/03/2012. Occupiers of nos. 36 and 40 Woodsome Road object on the following basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of keeping with the character of the conservation area • Will be visible from Boscastle Road and neighbouring gardens • Will be larger than neighbouring extensions • Overdevelopment • Will set a precedent • Loss of privacy - window to first floor side return and rear balcony will overlook gardens of nos. 36 and 40 • Loss of light – increase height of boundary wall will reduce light to ground floor kitchen, first floor room, conservatory and garden of no. 40 and loss of light to no. 36 • Loss of outlook to no. 36 					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Dartmouth Park CAAC object that the roofslope is inconsistent with other roofs in the terrace making it an incongruous feature. The enlarged glass doors and replacement of wall below would contribute to the loss of traditional/historic appearance of the rear elevation. Large amount of glazing would make insulation difficult or impossible.					

Site Description

The application site comprises a mid-terrace three-storey single dwellinghouse situated on the north-west side of Woodsome Road, close to the junction with Boscastle Road (to the south-west). The application site building is typical of that of the immediate area (which is residential in character) and includes a two-storey closet, which has been in-filled at ground floor level as part of a permission in 2005 (see relevant history below). The application site is located within Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Relevant History

2011/3018/P Alterations to rear side extension including replacement of window with door and balustrade at rear first floor level to dwelling (Class C3). Withdrawn

2010/3338/P Erection of rear dormer roof extension, reconfiguration of existing first floor rear extension including installation of Juliette balcony, erection of garden storage area and associated alterations to single family dwellinghouse (Class C3). Granted 23/08/2010

2005/0926/P Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a part one, part two storey rear extension. Granted 12/05/2005.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2011 –CPG1 paras 4.9-4.15

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement

NPPF 2012

Assessment

1 Introduction

1.1 Planning permission was granted (2010/3338/P) for the erection of a rear dormer, front rooflight, and the reconfiguration of the existing rear extension. It is proposed to amend this permission by lowering the rear extension by 300mm, and extending it sideways at first floor level by introducing a slope to the side return. The dormer, rooflight, and garden storage remain unaltered. The main issues are design and amenity.

2 Design

2.1 The existing building has a two storey closet wing with a mono-pitched roof sloping upwards towards the house and a single storey infill extension alongside it with a similarly pitched roof.

2.2 Permission has been granted to reconfigure the rear elevation by increasing the first floor element in width by 0.5m from 2.7m to 3.2m. The depth and height remained the same as existing and the sloping profile of the addition was to be retained. The proposal also included French doors and a Juliet balcony at rear first floor level, with an obscure glazed window to the side return. At ground floor level the existing sliding doors were to be extended across the width of the ground floor elevation. In relation to the works to the rear the provision of enlarged sliding doors at ground floor level and the Juliet balcony were considered to constitute permitted development to the single dwellinghouse. The other works at first floor level on the rear elevation were considered to be relatively minor in nature, subordinate to the existing house, and to preserve the character and

appearance of the conservation area.

- 2.3 The amended scheme seeks to extend the first floor element sideways by adding a sloping roof to the side return which would abut the party wall with no. 36. The previously approved pair of French doors at first floor level would be replaced with a wider row of four doors and the subsequently wider Juliet balcony would be further enlarged with the addition of a 500mm deep planter. The sloping side element would feature a high level window and terminate before it meets the rear elevation of the house creating a small lightwell in front of the first floor window.
- 2.4 The proposed extension at first floor level is not considered to be subordinate to the host building, it would be virtually full width as it would be more than half the width of the building at first floor level and would only slope down to the party wall with no. 36, which at 3.5m high is higher than a single storey. It would also bisect the first floor window of the host building when viewed from the rear. The bulk of the first floor element would further be emphasised by the additional doors, and by the addition of a wide planter in front of the Juliet balcony.
- 2.5 Whilst it is not uncommon for pairs of closet wings to have sloping roofs to reduce their bulk and create symmetry, the terrace comprises two storey, original and remodelled, closet wings that are largely half-width and maintain a solid to void rhythm at first floor level. The sloping side return disrupts this rhythm, and would be particularly noticeable as the rear of the property is not only visible from other properties in the conservation area, but also from the public realm.
- 2.6 Policies CS14 and DP24 expect development to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings as well as the character and proportions of the existing building. The addition of a sloping side to a closet wing with a flat roof would be an incongruous element at the rear of the terrace. The design is unique with no similar extensions in the terrace, and whilst extensions can be read as separate, later additions, their overall design should not harm the character and appearance of the host building or wider area. The appearance of the extension would further be harmed by the enlarged doors, whose design and width are more suitable to ground floor level, and by the additional planter. Policies CS14 and DP25 require a high quality of design and expect development to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas taking into account conservation area appraisal and management strategies.
- 2.7 The host building is identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy notes that within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area there are many interesting examples of historic rear elevations, many of which are exposed to public views from the surrounding streets. Woodsome Road was laid out in the 1870's and the rear is visible from Boscastle Road. The management strategy goes on to state that the original historic pattern of rear elevations within a street or group of buildings is an integral part of the character of the area and as such rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would diverge significantly from the historic pattern.
- 2.8 As such the proposal, due to its bulk, location and detailed design is considered to harm the character and appearance of the host building and the conservation area contrary to policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the LDF and associated planning guidance.

3 Amenity

- 3.1 In relation to no. 40, the flank wall of the ground and first floor would be approximately the same as existing. It would be no deeper and the parapet height would be relatively the same as the existing sloping roof. As such it is not considered that there would be a loss of daylight or sunlight to this property. There would be some visual encroachment towards the first floor windows of no. 36 from the first floor addition, however this is not considered to be significant and would be mitigated by its sloping profile, which is considered to minimise any impact on light or outlook for this adjoining property.

3.2 In terms of overlooking The enlarged windows to the rear at first floor level would offer a view of neighbouring gardens where little already exists, however the previous approval included a pair of French doors, and the increase in the area of the fenestration is not considered to significantly increase the scope for overlooking. The windows to the sloping side of the extension are high level and not considered to permit direct overlooking, and the round window is to a cupboard and considered to be too high and too small to be materially significant.

3.3 As such the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

4 Recommendation

4.1 Refuse 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