<b>Delegated Report</b>			Analysis shee	et	Expiry Date:	09/03/2012			
Members Briefing			N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	13/02/2012			
Officer				Application N					
Connie Petrou				2012/0111/P					
Application A	Address			<b>Drawing Num</b>	bers				
87 Broomsleig LONDON NW6 1QQ	gh Street			See decision r	ootice				
PO 3/4	Area Tea	m Signatur	C&UD	Authorised O	fficer Signature				
		Ū			Ğ				
Proposal(s)									
Erection of a single storey side extension to dwelling (Class C3)									
Recommendation(s):		Grant							
Application Type:		Householder Application							

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice								
Informatives:									
Consultations									
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	10	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01			
Summary of consultation responses:	Upstairs bedrood privacy Officers response Noise nuisance additional room; Additional parkind dumping of rubb Officer response therefore not conconstruction is s	e: see from co ish wo is Thes ubject	No. electronic objection  look to kitchen, front room rear windows; ould suffer same loss of light and most of all a loss of the paragraphs 4.1 -4.4  construction and extra noise generated from the oise from buildings and skips outside would attract would result in displacement of parking space.  ese are not material planning considerations and ered in the assessment of this application. Noise from ct to control under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 and live has been added to the decision notice.						
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	Not in a conserv	ation a	irea						

# **Site Description**

The site is a two storey end of terrace house located on the east side of Broomsleigh Street. The property is not listed and not located in a conservation area.

# **Relevant History**

Certfificate of Lawfulness (Proposed)

2011/5383/P - Installation of roof extension on rear roofslope and 3 x rooflights on front roofslope, erection of single-storey rear/side extension and alterations to doors and windows on rear elevation – Approved 14/12/11

## **Relevant policies**

# **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS1 (Distribution of Growth –make best use of limited land); CS5 (Manage impact of growth); CS14 (Promote high quality places and conserve our heritage)

DP24 (Securing high quality design); DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

**Camden Planning Guidance 2011** 

#### **Assessment**

## **Proposal**

- 1.1 Consent is sought for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear of the property which would fill the gap between the existing 2 storey side return and the boundary fence with no. 85. The extension would measure approximately 5.7m in length, 1.4m in width and have a minimum height of 2.5m and maximum of 3.0m with a lean to roof with two velux rooflights. French doors replicating those existing are proposed to open up the accommodation out into the rear garden. The extension is to be built in brick with timber doors.
- 1.2 A certificate of lawfulness for a similar infill extension was approved on 14/12/11 (see planning history) with the only difference being the extension extended a maximum of 3m from the rear elevation.

## **Principle**

2.1 LDF policies allow domestic extensions and alterations provided they do not harm the character and appearance of the existing property or the amenity of nearby neighbours and occupants. The impact of the development is discussed further in the report.

## 3.0 Visual Impact

3.1 The proposed extension would be at ground floor level only and would align with the rear wall of the existing 2 storey side return. As a result it would appear subordinate to the original building leaving a reasonably sized rear garden open and undeveloped. As the extension would be located to the rear of the building it would not cause any harm to the visual appearance of the terrace or the wider area and the materials used are considered sympathetic to the existing building. The detailed design of the doors matches the existing and is therefore, considered acceptable.

## 4.0 Residential Amenity

2.1 The external wall of the proposed extension rises a maximum of 500mm above the boundary (party) fence with no. 85 and the set back of the roof away from the boundary further minimises the

sense of enclosure to the adjoining ground floor windows and is therefore considered acceptable.			
4.2 Concerns have been raised with regard to the impact on light and outlook from the kitchen window. The kitchen window is considered to receive adequate natural light which would not be materially impacted by the infill extension which would be largely retained behind the existing boundary fence.			
4.3 Concerns have also been raised by the neighbouring property regarding loss of light to the upper floor rear windows. The extension would be entirely below the upper floor windows and while it is acknowledged that part of the views of the gardens would be inevitably lost, the loss of outlook is not considered such as to justify a refusal.			
4.4 The proposal is not considered to result in any loss of privacy as the patio doors look directly onto the garden space of the host property. No amenity issues are presented by the roof lights.			
Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission.			