

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		13/04/2012	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		22/03/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Elaine Quigley				2012/0779/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
4 Maresfield Gardens London NW3 5SU				See draft decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Change of use from hostel accommodation to single dwelling house (Class C3) and erection of rear extension at lower ground floor and upper ground floor levels (following demolition of existing outbuilding); roof terrace at rear upper ground floor level with stairs to garden; and installation of 3 x rooflights to rear roofslope.							
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission subject to conditions					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	19	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	02		
Summary of consultation responses:		A site notice was displayed on 22/02/2012 (expired 14/03/2012) and a press notice was published in the Ham & High on 01/03/2012 (expired 22/03/2012). 2 letters of support received from neighbouring properties at 11 Mourne House, 11 Maresfield Gardens, and 21 Mourne House, 11 Maresfield Gardens.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify		Fitzjohns/Netherhall CAAC was notified about the application. No response received to date.					

Site Description

The application site is a large semi-detached three-storey building set on a large plot of land. The site is located on the eastern side of Maresfield gardens and falls within the Fitzjohns/Netherall Conservation Area. The building is identified as part of a group of buildings (2-16 even) as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The property is read in the context of similar properties along Maresfield Gardens, all with a high level of original features and unity. The properties were built around 1870's with eclectic domestic styling overlaid onto solid geometric red brick massed forms.

No. 2 is part of a pair of semi-detached properties. The three storey bay window at lower ground, ground and first floor levels is one of the most important features on the rear elevation of the building. The building is not listed. The building currently has an authorised use as a hostel that was owned by Camden Council.

Relevant History

4 Maresfield Gardens

Planning permission was **granted** on 03/05/1939 for conversion of the premises into five self-contained flats (G7/3/A/56853).

Planning permission was **granted** on 03/01/2012 for change of use from hostel to single dwelling house (Class C3) (2011/5718/P).

Planning applications relating to adjoining properties

2 Maresfield Gardens

Planning permission was **granted** on 12/03/2009 for change of use from 5 to 6 flats, including erection of a basement extension with lightwell to the front and rear and a rear internal courtyard, erection of single-storey ground floor extension on the front elevation, erection of a lower ground and ground floor rear extension (2008/2288/P).

Planning permission was **granted** on 25/08/2010 for an amendment to planning permission granted on 12/03/2009 (2008/2288/P) including revision of internal layouts to provide vertically arranged duplex apartments, extension at lower ground floor level, addition of rear extension to coach house at lower ground and upper ground floor levels, changes to front fenestration on coach house and erection of a timber enclosure in rear garden (2010/2772/P).

Planning permission was **granted** on 12/07/2011 for amendments including change of use to 4 self-contained flats, amalgamation of the two internal courtyards into one, of planning permission granted 12/03/09 (2008/2288/P) as amended on 25/08/10 for change of use from 5 to 6 flats, basement extension with lightwell to front and rear and a rear internal courtyard, erection of single-storey ground floor extension on front elevation, erection of lower ground and ground floor rear extension, rear extension to coach house at lower ground and upper ground floor levels, changes to front fenestration on coach house and erection of a timber enclosure in rear garden (2011/2206/P).

Planning permission was **refused** on 04/11/2011 for amendments to planning permission granted 12/03/09 (2008/2288/P) as amended on 25/08/10 (2010/2772/P) and 12/07/11 (2011/2206/P) for change of use from original 5 flats to proposed 4 flats, including erection of a basement extension with lightwell to the front and rear and a rear internal courtyard, erection of single-storey ground floor extension on the front elevation, erection of a lower ground and ground floor rear extension, addition of rear extension to coach house at lower ground and upper ground floor levels, changes to front fenestration on coach house and erection of a timber enclosure in rear garden, namely to revise the internal layout and reduce the number of flats from proposed 4 to 3. (overall reduction in 2 flats from original 5) (2011/4584/P).

6 Maresfield Gardens

Planning permission was **granted** on 08/10/2001 for change of use of four flats back to a single dwelling house, together with the removal of the third storey of the rear extension, in association with the provision of a new roof terrace and balustrade and the installation of new windows (PWX0102023).

10 Maresfield Gardens

Planning permission was granted on 01/05/1998 for additions and alterations at the rear of the existing dwelling house including new rooflights, rebuilding of existing balcony at upper ground floor level and glazed extensions at lower ground and ground floor levels (PW9702977R1).

12-14 Maresfield Gardens (Anna Freud Centre)

Planning permission was granted on 11/11/2005 for erection of a single-storey rear extension with a roof terrace and metal railings on top, alterations to the front garden involving formation of an access ramp with retaining wall and hand rail plus, associated alterations to fenestration, to provide additional accommodation and disabled access for the mental health care centre (2005/3566/P).

16 Maresfield Gardens

No relevant planning history

Relevant policies

National Planning Guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012.

London Plan (2011)

- 3.3 (Increasing housing supply)
- 3.4 (Optimising housing potential)
- 3.5 (Quality and design of housing developments)
- 3.8 (Housing choice)
- 3.14 (Existing housing)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
- CS6 (Providing quality homes)
- CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)
- CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)

- DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)
- DP5 (Homes of different sizes)
- DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing)
- DP8 (Accommodation for homeless people and vulnerable people)
- DP9 (Student housing, bedsits and other housing with shared facilities)
- 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 (Design)

- Section 2 (Design excellence)
- Section 3 (Heritage)
- Section 4 (Extensions, alterations and conservatories)
- Section 6 (Landscaping design and trees)

CPG2 (Housing)

- Section 4 (Residential development standards)
- Section 5 (Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Housing)

Other supplementary guidance

- Fitzjohns / Netherhall Conservation Area Statement
- Camden Biodiversity Action Plan

Assessment

Proposal

Planning permission is sought for change of use from hostel accommodation to single dwelling house (Class C3) and erection of rear extension at lower ground floor and upper ground floor levels (following demolition of existing outbuilding); roof terrace at rear upper ground floor level with stairs to garden; and installation of 3 x rooflights to rear roofslope.

Planning permission for the change of use from hostel accommodation to single family dwelling (Class C3) has already been established by the previously approved planning permission in January 2012 (see planning history above for further details). The assessment below relates only to the external alterations proposed as part of the application.

Assessment

The main considerations as part of this application are:

- Design
- Amenity
- Trees and landscaping

Design

The original proposal sought permission for the erection of rear extension at lower ground floor to first floor level (following demolition of existing outbuilding); roof terrace at rear ground floor level with stairs to garden; erection of side extension at lower ground and ground floor (following removal of fire escape stairs); and installation of 3 x rooflights to rear roofslope.

Amendments

Concerns were raised during the course of the application in relation to the principle of a two storey side extension, the extension to the bay window on the rear elevation at lower ground to first floor levels and the design of the extensions at upper ground floor level on the rear elevation. Following discussions with the agent the proposal has been revised to amend the proposal by:

- Removal of the lower ground to first floor extension to the bay window on the rear elevation
- Reduction in the size of the upper ground floor single storey extension on the rear elevation from 6.5m (width) to 3.8m. The design and materials of the extension have been amended from contemporary glass and zinc construction to more traditional design using traditional brickwork with timber painted windows and sloping roof using tiles to match the existing roof. The existing openings on the rear elevation at upper ground floor level would be retained.
- Amendment to the materials of the balustrade at upper ground floor level from glass to metal
- Removal of the two storey side extension and retention of the existing fire escape staircase

Lower ground floor extension

The lower ground floor extension would be full width and would measure 5.5m (length) by 11.4m (width) by 3m (height). It would be constructed using brick to match the existing brickwork of the building and would include aluminium bi-folding doors that would extend 8.6m (width) across the rear elevation of the proposed extension. The extension would result in the loss of part of the original bay window at lower ground floor level. Although this is regrettable this part of the building is mainly screened from views by the raised rear garden level. The rear elevations of the neighbouring properties, including no. 6 (other half of the pair of semi-detached properties) have been altered and extended over time with the construction of lower ground floor extensions. No. 6 has a two storey extension that is centrally located on the rear elevation of the building. The symmetry of the no. 4 and 6 as a pair and the harmony of the group of buildings as a whole have already been altered at this level. Therefore the removal of the bay window at lower ground floor level would be considered acceptable.

The lower ground floor extension would be full width and would be single storey in height. It would be subordinate to the building in terms of its scale and proportions and would be considered acceptable. The proposed extension would be broadly consistent with the pattern of development in the surrounding area and would not be out of character with the rhythm of the existing rear extensions to the south and north.

The proposed lower ground floor extension would be constructed from brick to match the existing building. This would be considered appropriate as it would reflect the character of the existing building and would ensure that the new work would blend in with the old. The full height sliding door frame would be constructed using aluminium. Although this is not a traditional material, given the location of the extension at lower ground floor level it would be considered acceptable on this modern extension.

The roof of the new extension would be partly enclosed to create a terrace. The terrace would measure 34 sq. m and would be covered in some form of paving slabs. The terrace would be enclosed by a metal railing. The simple design of the railings and use of traditional materials are considered acceptable.

Upper ground floor extension

A single storey extension would be constructed on the rear elevation at upper ground floor level. This would measure 3.8m (width) by 1.35m (length) by 4.3m (height) to the ridge of the roof. It would be constructed using brickwork to match the existing. The design of the upper ground floor extension has been revised to match the dimensions and design of the upper floor extension at the adjoining property at no. 6. The extension is small in terms of its scale on the rear elevation of the building and would be considered acceptable. The detailed design would be more sympathetic to the age and character of the main building and would provide a more considered design approach to the rear elevation as a whole. The design of the extension would help to reinstate some of the symmetry that has been lost between the pair of semi-detached properties and this design approach has been encouraged by the Council.

The proposal would include the erection of a new metal staircase to provide access from the upper ground floor level to the rear garden. There is an existing metal staircase adjacent to no. 6 and this would be relocated to the other side of the building adjacent to no. 2. The relocation of the staircase is considered acceptable. The simple design and use of metal as a traditional material would be considered acceptable.

Two storey side extension

There is an existing fire escape staircase that extends from lower ground to first floor level on the side elevation of the building that was associated with the use of the building as a hostel. In the original submission this would have been removed and it was proposed to construct a two storey side extension measuring 5.4m (length) by 1.5m (width) by 4.9m (height). Concerns were raised by the Council regarding the loss of the gap between the buildings as it would reduce the possibility of obtaining views into the rear gardens of the properties, would alter the original form and character of the house and would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties and was not be considered acceptable. This element has been removed from the scheme. It is regrettable that the applicant would not agree to the removal of the fire escape stair in association with the proposed works however as it is an existing structure its removal cannot be insisted upon.

Replacement windows

The proposal would include the replacement of all timber framed windows on the front and rear elevations with double glazing timber framed windows. The windows on the front elevation of the building are single paned sash windows with top panel windows that include decorative curved mullions and leaded glass. The main window frames are quite robust and the replacement with double glazed timber framed windows would not alter the character or appearance of the building. The applicants have agreed that these details would be replicated either by reinstating the top panels as single glazed windows or ensuring that the double glazed windows would replicate these fine mullion details. A condition would be attached requiring details of the windows to be submitted and approved by the local planning authority.

Rooflights

The proposal would include the installation of 3 roof lights on the rear roof slope of the building. They would measure 1m by 1m and would be set back 2.6m from the eaves of the roof. They would match the number, size and positioning of the roof lights in the adjoining property at no. 6 (other half of the pair). The roof lights would be considered acceptable.

Amenity

Extensions

The adjoining properties at nos. 2 and 6 Maresfield Gardens have existing extensions at lower ground and upper ground floor level. The proposed extensions would not result in any loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook and would be considered acceptable. The drawings illustrate that part of the roof of the extension adjacent to the boundary with no. 6 would include a green roof. A condition would be attached to any permission to restrict access to this part of the roof in order to protect the amenity of the adjoining property.

No windows would be proposed in the side elevations of the extensions at lower ground and upper ground floor level. There would be no adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.

Upper ground floor terrace

The proposal would include a terrace area at upper ground floor level that would project 5.1m from the main rear elevation of the building and would measure 34 sq. m. The southern side boundary of no. 6 is lined with mature trees that restrict direct views from the application site into the garden of the property. The terrace would be set away from the boundary with no. 6 by 4m. It would not afford any further harmful direct views into the garden area of the neighbouring property than already exists at present. There are 3 upper ground floor window openings in side elevation of the three storey rear extension at no. 6. During the site visit it was apparent that the space within this extension at lower ground and upper ground floor level is a double height space with no direct views out from these windows. Due to the restricted internal floor to ceiling heights it would not be possible to install a floor to separate the lower ground floor and upper ground floor levels within this extension. There would therefore be no direct overlooking from the proposed terrace into the windows of no. 6 and its size and location would be considered acceptable.

No. 2 is currently being redeveloped to provide 6 flats. An area under the rear garden is being excavated that would create an external courtyard area and habitable space that includes bi-folding doors that serve a bedroom for the lower ground floor flat. The terrace would be set away from the boundary with no. 2 by 1.8m. There is a 4.1m high brick wall (measured from the raised garden level of the application site) between the application property and no. 2 that extends 4.8m from the rear elevation of the adjoining building into the garden. This would screen any views from the terrace into these windows and external courtyard area and would be considered acceptable.

Excavation works

A section of the rear garden adjacent to the main rear elevation of the building would be excavated to create the lower ground floor extension and patio area. This would measure 5.9m (length) by 1m (depth) and would extend across the rear elevation of the building. This level of excavation work at lower ground floor level would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would be considered acceptable.

Trees and landscaping

An arboricultural report has been submitted with the application in relation to the removal of four small trees in the rear garden close to the existing house. They would include 3 x hollies and 1 x laburnum. The Council's Tree Officer has confirmed that these are small trees with low visibility from the public realm and it is considered that their removal would have a very low impact on the character of the area. The remaining tree works recommended in the report are considered to be minor in nature and to be acceptable.

The tree protection and arboricultural method statement is in line with the British Standard: BS5837:2005 Trees in relation to construction: recommendations and are considered to be sufficient to prevent damage to any of the trees which are to be retained. It is recommended that a condition is added to any approval of the application requiring evidence that the tree protection has been erected on site prior to the commencement of works on site.

Conclusion

The proposed extensions to the rear of the property would be considered acceptable in terms of scale, bulk, mass and detailed design and would not harm the character and appearance of the building or the conservation area subject to conditions. The extensions and terrace area to the rear would not have an adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties and would be considered acceptable. The removal of the trees would not have an adverse impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area and tree protection details would be conditioned to ensure all other trees are protected and retained during construction work.

Recommendation

Grant planning permission subject to conditions

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