

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>10/11/2011</b>
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	20/10/11
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>		
Connie Petrou			2011/4629/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
FLAT 1 66-68 GLOUCESTER AVENUE LONDON NW1 8JD					
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Erection of single storey ground floor rear extension with green roof to dwelling (Class C3) and installation of door to fence in rear garden.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant</b>			
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Full Planning Permission</b>			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice				
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	27	No. of responses	03	No. of objections	02
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notice displayed 21/09/11 Press notice advertised 29/09/11</p> <p>66-68 GLOUCESTER AVENUE</p> <p>I own the flat above the property in this application and have no objection whatever to the application. There is no problem with loss of light or overlooking as far as I know and the garden is very small and dark due to the 8m wall at its northeast boundary. To extend the flat this small extent into the garden poses no problem and will not cause any harm to the flats around the property.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed sedum roof beneath my flat's windows I am opposed to this. It is a concession to the environmental lobby and its maintenance will definitely cause a problem in this position. I suspect that no-one will maintain it and it will become a receptacle for windblown rubbish. If it becomes water laden in heavy rain it may well pose a drainage problem to the flat below. It will not drain in the way a normal flat roof will drain. The current owners of the property may look after it but once they move out I envisage it will become neglected. It is very difficult to gain access to the roof for maintenance and it will soon become an eyesore and a problem.</p> <p>I urge you to give this application consent with the condition of removal of the sedum roof element of the plans.</p> <p>Officer response: see paragraph 5.1</p> <p>Flat 1, 70-72 Gloucester Avenue</p> <p>Supports application subject to the developer taking full responsibility for any damages caused to flat 1, 70-72 Gloucester Avenue with regard to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Breaking of garden wall</li> <li>• Damaging water pipes while digging</li> <li>• Making sure noise levels are not too high and that building work not carried out at weekend.</li> </ul> <p>Officer response: These are not material planning considerations and are dealt with by other legislation. A condition with regard to construction noise has been added to the decision notice which must be adhered to.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p>Primrose Hill CAAC</p> <p>Object.</p> <p>1. While we note that the proposal has been modified from that we objected to in August (August 2011/3671/P), there is no evidence that our objections on harm to the natural light, sense of enclosure, and amenity of neighbours have been addressed. Given the location, this is a very sensitive issue. The impact needs to be assessed and the assessment made part of the</p>					

application.

2. It is the further extension beyond the main rear building line to which we object. In this case this has, in addition to the potential harm set out above, a significant impact on the rear garden. A sketch showing a planting scheme would make it easier to assess what is hard-surface and what is not. We do not accept that a sedum roof is an ecologically acceptable replacement for permeable green space.

Officer response: see paragraph 3.1- 3.2 and 4.1 -4.2.

### **Site Description**

The site is located on the north side of Gloucester Avenue and is occupied by a 4 storey mid terrace town house. The property is not listed but is located in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

### **Relevant History**

2011/3671/P - Erection of single storey ground floor rear extension with green roof to dwelling (Class C3) and installation of door to fence in rear garden – Withdrawn 15/09/11

### **Relevant policies**

#### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS1 (Distribution of Growth); CS5 (Manage impact of growth); CS14 (Promote high quality places and conserve our heritage)

DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction); DP24 (Securing high quality design); DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage/conservation areas); DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours).

#### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

#### **Belsize Conservation Area Statement**

## Assessment

1.0 Consent is sought for a single storey rear extension which projects approximately 2.5m from the rear wall of the property, will be approximately 2.1m wide and approximately 2.8m high with a sedum roof. The proposed extension would The proposed extension will have painted rendered brick walls similar to the existing ground floor with aluminium framed sliding doors to the side and repositioning of existing window on new rear wall. The application also proposes a 'green' roof. The property has an existing infill extension to the rear.

The main issues are:

- design
- neighbour amenity
- the green roof

## 2 Revision

2.1 The original proposal featured a 3m deep extension which would have resulted in an unreasonably small useable garden area. This was considered unacceptable and the depth of the extension has now been reduced to half of the length of the garden.

## 3 Design

3.1 The design is simple replicating the existing rear elevation with painted rendered brick helping it relate to the existing building and surrounding properties. The extension is of modest depth and height, therefore remaining subordinate to the host building. The garden area is 36.25m<sup>2</sup> and the area of the existing infill extension plus the proposed extension comes to 16.6m<sup>2</sup> which is considered to allow the retention of a reasonably sized garden. It is important to note that amendments have allowed for a usable area of garden space both to the rear and side. The garden area to the rear is approximately 2.5m deep and therefore the outlook from the rear window is considered to be reasonable, in terms of sense of enclosure. The CAAC have requested a planting scheme, however, the level of information submitted is considered adequate and the lack of a planting scheme does not, warrant a reason for refusal. As the alterations are exclusively at the rear and not visible from the public domain, the materials proposed are considered acceptable and should not harm the character and appearance of the building or the conservation area. As such, the design, materials and scale of the proposed extension are not considered to harm the character or appearance of the building or conservation area.

3.2 The host property is within a terrace which has had a number of alterations conducted at the rear of the properties, albeit most of these have been minor infill extension there are a number of other examples of more substantial extensions including those at nos. 62-64 and no. 88 Gloucester Avenue. Therefore, it is not considered that the proposals would harm the integrity of the terrace when read as a whole.

3.3 The proposal is considered to comply with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the LDF and associated planning guidance.

## 4 Amenity

4.1 The proposed extension would extend approximately 0.6m above the boundary fence with adjoining property no. (66-68 Gloucester Avenue). Given the modest extension, the proposal is not considered to materially affect the light to this property or introduce any issues of privacy or overlooking.

4.2 The new doors face onto the side of the garden, however, given there is a 2m boundary wall between properties this is not considered to result in any loss of privacy from overlooking to the neighbouring property. There are no windows on the roof and therefore would not result in any overlooking from windows above. The proposed works are entirely at ground level and therefore do not restrict any views from the upper floor flats.

4.3 As the green roof will not be accessible for amenity purposes, there is no potential for overlooking or loss of privacy issues to adjoining properties.

4.4 As such, the proposal is considered to comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF.

### **Other Matters**

5.1 Policy DP22 requires development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. It states that schemes must incorporate green or brown roofs and green walls wherever suitable. The green roof was introduced as a means of reducing the visual impact of the extension, improving the outlook of occupiers from the upper windows and providing habitat to promote biodiversity. Maintenance of the green roof is not expected to be required more than 4 times a year. A schedule for maintenance of the green roof, specifically with regard to replacing modules if they die has been submitted as part of the application and is considered acceptable. With regard to the concerns about drainage, green roofs have the benefit of storing water and slowing its rate of movement, thus reducing the risk of flooding.

**Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission.**

## **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 7<sup>th</sup> November 2011.**

**For further information see**

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