

| | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| Delegated Report (Members' Briefing) | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | | 29/12/2011 | |
| | | N/A / attached | | Consultation Expiry Date: | | 08/12/2011 | |
| Officer | | | | Application Number(s) | | | |
| Rob Tulloch | | | | 2011/5180/P | | | |
| Application Address | | | | Drawing Numbers | | | |
| 21 Downside Crescent LONDON NW3 2AN | | | | See decision notice | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| Erection of a single storey rear extension with roof terrace and alterations to existing extension at ground floor level, installation of two rooflights to side roof slope, removal of existing car port and reinstatement of ground floor window to front elevation, erection of front boundary wall with railings, alterations to doors and windows to side elevation, replacement of existing rear windows at second floor level, replacement of rear first floor windows with French doors and addition of a Juliette balcony to residential units (Class C3). | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Grant Planning Permission | | | | | |
| Application Type: | | Full Planning Permission | | | | | |
| Conditions: | | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | | No. notified | 14 | No. of responses | 07 | No. of objections | 07 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | | <p>Site notice 14/11/2011 Press advert 17/11/2011</p> <p>Objections have been received from nos. 11, 19c, 23, 23a & 31 Downside Crescent, no. 72 Lawn Road and a future occupier of 23 Downside Crescent. These can be summarised as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals would harm the character and appearance of the host building and conservation area (see paragraphs 2.1-2.11) • Overdevelopment (2.6-2.11) • Illogical to remove an "out of keeping" element from the front whilst adding an incongruous element to the rear (2.6-2.11) • The rears of nos. 23 Downside Crescent onwards are unaltered (2.6-2.11) • Filling in at the rear is out of keeping with the architectural style of the building(2.6-2.11) • Inappropriate design of extension (2.6-2.11) • Juliette balcony is out of character (2.6-2.11) • Would set a precedent (2.6-2.11) • Nos. 3, 9, 15 and 25 Downside Crescent already have infill extensions leading to a loss of garden space (2.6-2.11) • Overlooking from the proposed roof terrace to the flats at no. 23 | | | | | |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| | <p>Downside Crescent (3.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise nuisance from the proposed terrace (3.3) • Loss of daylight/sunlight to patio and living room of no. 23 Downside Crescent (3.1) • Light pollution (3.1) • Noise and fumes from flues (3.3) • Building Regulations concerns over glazed side elevation (Building Regulations are separate from Planning) |
| CAAC/Local group comments: | Parkhill CAAC were notified, but did not respond. |

Site Description

The application site is a late-Victorian three storey semi-detached house on the western side of Downside Crescent currently divided into two flats, one on the ground floor and one on the upper floors (although planning permission has been granted for the use of the building as a single dwelling – see relevant history). It is constructed in red brick with a front gable and two storey bay, and also features a timber carport added in the 1960's. It lies within the Parkhill Conservation Area and although not listed is identified as a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area.

Relevant History

2011/5157/P Conversion of 2 x self contained flats into a single dwelling house (Class C3). Granted 08/12/2011.

TPD1869/1983 Erection of car port at 21, Downside Crescent involving alterations to and use of part of hallway of house. Granted 26/03/1965

TP100690/3718 Alterations to existing house at 21 Downside Crescent, Hampstead, to form one self-contained flat on the ground floor and one self-contained maisonette on the first and second floors. Granted 03/06/1960

5 Downside Crescent

2010/0611/P Erection of a rear dormer roof extension, single-storey ground floor rear extension (following demolition of existing single-storey ground floor rear extension), installation of two windows on south side elevation and associated alterations to single family dwellinghouse (Class C3). Granted 20/04/2010

9 Downside Crescent

2006/4761/P Erection of a conservatory to rear of self-contained flat (Class C3). Granted 15/12/2006

15 Downside Crescent

2006/2759/P Certificate of Lawful Proposed Development for a single-storey rear extension to the dwellinghouse (Class C3). Granted 24/08/2006

13 Downside Crescent

2004/2145/P Erection of single storey rear glazed extension. Granted 13/07/2004

29 Downside Crescent

PEX0100668 Application for Certificate of Lawfulness for a proposed development for the erection of a ground floor side and rear extension. Granted 09/10/2001

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

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

Parkhill and Upper Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy

Assessment

1 Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for various works of alteration and extension including:

- Remodelling the existing rear extension and the addition of an infill extension to the side with associated roof terrace
- Alterations to fenestration at side and rear
- Insertion of two rooflights to the side roofslope
- Removal of the car port and the reinstatement of the bay to the front elevation
- Erection of railings to front boundary wall

1.2 The proposal has been revised to move the infill extension in from the boundary wall with no. 23 Downside Crescent by 350mm, to replace the brickwork above the boundary wall with glass, and to add a hipped roof to the existing extension rather than a gable. The size of the proposed terrace has also been reduced.

1.3 The main issues are:

- Design/impact on conservation area
- neighbour amenity

2 Design/impact on conservation area

2.1 The application site forms part of a uniform street of semi-detached houses. Original architectural details include gables, bays and single storey rear extensions. Whilst the front elevations of the buildings in the street remain largely unaltered, several extensions and conservatories have been erected at the rear.

Front elevation

2.2 Whilst nearly all of the buildings in the street are largely unaltered at the front, the application site features a timber car port that was erected in the 1960's. It is considered to be an incongruous element that detracts from the appearance of the conservation area and also resulted in the partial loss of a front bay. It is proposed to remove the car port and reinstate the ground floor window, which is welcome as both Camden Planning Guidance and the Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy welcome the re-instatement of original features. The hardstanding would remain.

2.3 It is also proposed to reduce the height of the front boundary wall from 1m to 800mm and erect 600mm high railings on top. The railings are a simple metal design. Other properties in the street, such as nos. 15 and 25 have railings, and they are not considered to be out of character with the area.

Side elevation

2.4 To the south side elevation it is proposed to replace a ground floor window with a door, and insert two timber framed windows at first and second floor levels. This side is not very visible from the street, the design and materials are appropriate for a conservation area, and these modest alterations are not considered to harm the appearance of the building.

- 2.5 At roof level it is proposed to insert two rooflights to the south side of the hipped roof. The rooflights would be conservation style and measure 1m x 1.2m and 500mm x 700mm and be virtually flush with the roofslope. Due to their location on a side roofslope there would be limited visibility from the street.

Rear elevation

- 2.6 Most of the buildings have their original single storey rear additions with hipped roofs which contribute to the appearance of the rears of the buildings. The application site retains its rear extension, but the roof has been removed to provide a terrace. This is considered to be a particularly unattractive alteration with solid metal balustrading and a metal staircase to the rear. It is proposed to reinstate the hipped roof separated from the rear elevation by a rooflight, this is a revision as the original proposal featured a gable similar to an extension granted in 2010 at no. 5 Downside Crescent. It is considered that the hipped profile would relate to both the original design of the extension and the pattern created by the original roof slopes. The staircase would be removed and sliding doors would be added to the rear elevation.
- 2.7 It is also proposed to infill the space between the original addition and the boundary with no. 23 Downside Crescent. The infill extension would measure 4.5m (w) x 3m (h), and at 5.5m deep it would be the same depth as the original extension, as such it is considered to be subordinate to the host building. It would be largely glazed with a slate roof and feature sliding doors at the rear. The infill extension would also feature a terrace measuring 2.4m x 2.6m with glass balustrading. Overall it is a contemporary design which is not considered to harm the character or appearance of the host building or conservation area and would be read as a separate modern addition to the building with a lightweight appearance that goes some way to preserving the solid to void rhythm created by the original rear additions.
- 2.8 The rears of the properties on this side of Downside Crescent have been variously altered over time. Some properties, such as nos. 5, 11, 15, 29 (see relevant history for details) have lost their original rear additions, and others such as nos. 5, 9, and 13 have infill extension or conservatories. In this context it is not considered that the proposal would harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.
- 2.9 The Conservation Area Management Strategy does not highlight rear extensions as a current issue for the conservation area. In terms of management of change, it does seek to resist the loss of private open spaces and recommends that any development of rear garden spaces should not detract from the general feeling of openness and should ensure that most of the existing garden space is retained. The existing garden covers an area of approximately 150sqm, the proposal would result in the loss of approximately 25sqm so it would allow for the retention of a reasonably sized garden.
- 2.10 It is also proposed to replace two windows at second floor level with timber double glazed units to match the design of the existing windows, and two windows at first floor level with timber framed French doors. One door would provide access to the terrace, the other would face a glass Juliette balcony. The doors would be the same width as the existing windows and the lowering of the sills and the addition of glass balustrading are considered to be minor alterations that would not harm the appearance of the building.
- 2.11 In conclusion the proposal is not considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The removal of the car port is particularly welcome as this detracts from the character and appearance of the conservation area and its visual impact is exacerbated due to its prominent location. The works of alteration and extension including the construction of a more modest terrace and reinstatement of a hipped roof to the original to the rear are not considered to be harmful. The remainder of the works are relatively minor and most could be

carried out under permitted development if the building reverts to a single dwelling. As such the proposal is not considered to harm the character or appearance of the host building or conservation area and would comply with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

3 Amenity

- 3.1 The rear elevation of no. 23 Downside Crescent faces north east and has double doors opening out to the rear. The infill extension would abut the boundary, its flank wall would be set in 300mm from the boundary, rise 900mm above the existing boundary wall, and be constructed in glass. These revisions have been made to mitigate against loss of light to the ground floor of no. 23. It is acknowledged that there would be some loss of light, but due to the orientation of the rear elevation i.e. not within 90° of due south, the height of the proposed extension and the use of glass, it is not considered that a loss of daylight or sunlight would be significant. The narrow area of glazing is not considered to significantly harm amenity in terms of light pollution.
- 3.2 The application already has a roof terrace measuring 3.5m (w) x 5m (d) on top of the existing rear addition, the proposed pitched roof would cover this area and a new terrace is proposed 3.7m closer to the boundary with no.23 locating it 2m away from the boundary. The proposed terrace would be 2.5m wide and 2.5m deep (a reduction from the originally proposed 4.5m) and feature glass balustrading. The reduction in depth means that the angle of view towards no. 23 remains the same, albeit from a closer vantage point. The existing terrace already permits views into the gardens of neighbouring properties and oblique views into windows, the relocation and reduction in size of the terrace is not considered to significantly increase overlooking to neighbouring properties. A condition will ensure that only the terrace shown on the plans is used for such purposes and the other areas of flat roof will be accessed only for maintenance.
- 3.3 As the existing terrace is larger than that proposed it is not considered that noise resulting from the use of the terrace would increase. Although an objection has been raised regarding the positioning of flues, none are indicated in the proposal and the location and impact on neighbourhood amenity are covered by Environmental Health legislation.
- 3.4 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: Grant Planning Permission

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 19th December 2011.

For further information see

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