Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Da	ate: 09/11/20	011	
		N/A / attached		Consultat Expiry Da	1 4/1(1/2)	011	
Officer			Application Nu	Application Number(s)			
Hugh Miller			2011/3615/P	2011/3615/P			
Application Address			Drawing Numb	Drawing Numbers			
3a & 3b Bartholomew Road London NW5 2AH			Refer to draft De	Refer to draft Decision Notice			
PO 3/4 Area Team Signature C&UD			Authorised Off	Authorised Officer Signature			
Proposal(s)							
Erection of single - storey extension at rear lower ground floor level, to single family dwellinghouse (Class C3). Grant							
Recommendation(s):	Orani						
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission						
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:							
Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice						
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	09	No. of responses	00 No	o. of objections	00	
	Advertised in	local prod	No. Electronic	00	20.20/10/2011		
Summary of consultation responses:	Advertised in local press Ham & High 29/9/2011, expires 20/10/2011. Site Notice displayed 23/9/2011, expires 14/10/2011.						
	Bartholomew Estate CAAC: Comment						
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	This extension appears not to be in keeping with the house and we consider that neighbouring properties may incur loss of light.						
	Officer Comment. The applicant revised the proposal and a single-storey extension is now the subject of officers' assessment.						

Site Description

The site is a 3 storey semi-detached property located on the southern side of Bartholomew Road and until recently comprised self-contained flats. The property is not listed but is located within the Bartholomew Estate conservation area. It is referred to in the Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area Statement as making a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the area.

Relevant History

December 2010 – PP Granted - Change of use from two residential dwelling to a single dwelling (Class C3) with the erection of a single storey rear extension; ref. 2010/5703/P. Extant rear extension not implemented.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

Development Policies Development Plan

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

CPG 2011

Section 1

Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area Statement.

Assessment

Overview

In December the Council granted planning permission for the change of use from two self – contained flats to a single dwelling house including the erection of a single storey rear extension as replacement for single-storey conservatory extension.

The extant approved extension comprises brick walls, French doors and mono - pitched roof. It had dimensions of 5.5m wide x 4m deep x 3.5m height - (ridge); 3.0m roof eaves.

Original proposal: - Erection of two storey extension at rear to residential unit (Class C3).

Following discussion with the applicant/ agent, the proposal was amended and a revised single-storey extension was submitted for consideration.

Revised Proposal

✓ Erection of single - storey extension at rear lower ground floor level, to single family dwellinghouse.

Design and appearance

The former single –storey hipped roof conservatory extension has been demolished in keeping with the recent planning approval as noted above. The host building forms a pair of semi-detached buildings (3a /3b & 5) with 2-storey shallow depth return at the rear between the upper ground and first floor levels and a balcony is also located at the upper ground floor level. The shallow depth returns are characteristic of the houses in this part of Bartholomew Road.

The revised extension has dimensions of 5.3m width x 4.0m depth x 3.7m height and it supersedes

the original 2-storey extension. It would comprise brick walls plus timber framed glazed fixed panel /window and timber framed glazed bi-folding doors also flat roof set below raised brick parapet. The extension parapet would align with the height of the existing balcony height at upper ground floor level and would be more sympathetic in its appearance in this setting. The replacement single-storey extension as revised is considered an improvement because of its design, reduced height and bulk. Whilst it could be argued that the proposal could upset the rhythm and ordered pattern of the rear elevation, the elevation has restrictive private views from the rear windows of neighbouring dwellinghouses and not from the public realm as it would be screen from view by existing boundary fence, privet hedge and trees located in the rear garden. The revised extension would be subordinate in scale and proportion to the host building and is not considered to result in harm to the appearance of the host building or the conservation area.

Extant approved single-storey extension v. Revised single-storey extension

Except for the similarities of their footprint and use of materials the extensions (extant approved and current revision) differ in detail design, bulk, and height and also how they relate to the rear elevation of the host building. The extant scheme appears overly solid in its appearance due in part to the small sized door and window openings and their arrangement. However, its mono-pitched roof offers dual aspects **a**] by setting below the height of the upper ground floor balcony it exposes rather than competes with the host building rear elevation and **b**] it reduces its visual bulk. On the other hand, the revised proposal includes larger sized glazed openings on the south side (rear) and east side (high floor to ceiling height) which reduces its visible bulk but the aligned balcony height and parapet would give balance and articulation not to mention a light-weight appearance.

Notwithstanding, the above observations, it is considered that the current revision is on balance acceptable due to its design, scale and proportion; complementary use of materials whilst minimising its visual bulk add to its acceptability here. The revised extension is not considered to cause harm to the appearance of the host building or the conservation area.

Amenity

The window and door openings on the rear elevation of this semi-detached pair of houses (no.5) are orientated due south-east. The location, setting and height of the single-storey extension would not cause harm through loss of day/sunlight to the habitable rooms of occupiers in neighbouring houses. Neither would it harm the neighbouring occupiers' outlook or views. It would not result in any adverse impacts to neighbouring amenity in terms of outlook, privacy, or sunlight/daylight.

Recommendation: Grant 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