| Delegated Rep | | port | Analysis | sheet | Expiry Date: | | 29/09/2011 | | |
|---|----------|--|-------------|------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|------------|----|--|
| | | | N/A / attac | ched | Consultation Expiry Date: 30/8/20 | |)11 | | |
| Officer | | | | Application N | Application Number(s) | | | | |
| Hugh Miller | | | | 2011/3820/P | 2011/3820/P | | | | |
| Application Address | | | | Drawing Num | Drawing Numbers | | | | |
| Flat Ground Floor 22 Bartholomew Villas London NW5 2LL | | | | Please refer to | Please refer to draft decision notice | | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Tea | m Signature | C&UD | Authorised Of | Authorised Officer Signature | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | | | |
| Erection of replacement single-storey full-width extension at rear ground floor to existing self- contained flat (Class C3). | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Grant | Grant | | | | | | |
| Application Type: | | Full Planning Permission | | | | | | | |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | | | | |
| Consultation | S | | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | | No. notified | 08 | No. of responses | 00 | No. of o | objections | 00 | |
| | | | | No. Electronic | 00 | | | | |
| Summary of consultation responses: | | Application advertised in Ham & High 18/8/2011, expires 08/09/2011. Site Notice displayed 10/8/2011, expires 31/8/2011. | | | | | | | |
| CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify | | Bartholomew Estate CAAC: No response at time of writing. | | | | | | | |

Site Description

The application building comprises a 3-storey + part single, part 2 and part 3-storey addition that forms the end of terrace property. It is located on the west side of Bartholomew Villas, west of the junction with Lawford Road and south of Patshull Road. The building is sub-divided into self-contained flats. The building is located within the Bartholomew Estate conservation area. The building is not listed. The application building has being indentified as making a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the area.

Relevant History

October 1989 – PP Refused - The erection of front and rear extensions at second floor level to provide additional residential accommodation for the upper maisonette; ref. 8903358.

July 1981 – PP Granted - Change of use to a self-contained flat on the ground floor with a selfcontained maisonette on first and second floors, including works of conversion.; ref G12/19/12/32531

July 1981 – PP Granted - Change of use to a self-contained flat on the ground floor with a selfcontained maisonette on the first and second floors, including works of conversion; ref. G12/19/12/32532

March 1982 – PP Granted - The erection of two bathroom extensions, one at first floor level at the rear, the other at second floor level at the side.; ref G12/19/12/33520.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development CS14 – Promoting high guality places and conserving our heritage

Development Policies

DP24 –Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

CPG 2011

Assessment

Proposal

 Erection of replacement single-storey full-width extension at rear ground floor to existing selfcontained flat (Class C3)

The main issues concern design, impact on the appearance of the building and neighbour amenity.

During the courses of the assessment the proposal was amended to **a**] lower the height of the extension to 2.8m (3.3 original) **b**] increase the proportions of the glazed sliding doors.

Design and appearance

The existing rear extensions comprise part mono-pitched glazed conservatory and two part-single storey brick additions that have resulted in an irregular "L" shaped footprint. A contemporary designed single-storey flat roof extension is proposed as replacement for the existing mixed of glazed and brick extensions. The proposed full-width extension has dimensions of 6.0m depth x 9.5m width x 2.8.0m height and comprise timber framed glazed sliding doors, timber framed projecting box window and self-coloured STO Render.

The existing extensions comprise solid and light-weight structures, which are generally acceptable, except in this instance for their uneven height, footprint, age and form was considered to merit realignment. The replacement single-storey extension as revised is considered an improvement because of its uncluttered appearance as demonstrated in its design and reduced height. The horizontal setting combining complementary use of materials whilst minimising its visual bulk add to its acceptability here. It would also give a balance appearance, harmony and rhythm as compared to the existing extensions. The proposed extension would align with the depth of the existing rear most positioned brick addition and would also aligned with the depth of the 2-storey closet wing at no.20. Although the proposed extension would appears to be large, the additional floor area measure approximately 12.85sqm, which in the context of the host buildings' footprint is considered acceptable because the extension would be subordinate in scale and proportion to the host building. Moreover, the extension would not be visible from the public realm being enclosed by high brick boundary walls and buildings. On balance therefore, it is considered that the proposed extension would not harm the appearance of the host building neither would it impact detrimentally on the character or appearance of the terrace of which it forms part or the Bartholomew Estate Conservation Area.

Neighbour amenity

At no.20, a window and a half-glazed door lie opposite the conservatory and a second window opening is located on the rear elevation of the closet wing. The existing window closest to the host building is orientated due south –west and it is the source of day/ sunlight and outlook from the kitchen at the ground floor at no. 20.

The extensions' increased depth would be visible from the window closest to it. However, it is considered that the extensions' reduced height (2.8m) would be sufficiently low not to cause harm through loss of sun/ daylight. Neither is considered that the extension would cause additional unacceptable harm through loss of outlook or views.

There are no proposed side facing windows to no. 20, therefore, there will not be any overlooking.

Conclusion

The proposed replacement single-storey extension is considered satisfactory for all the reasons discussed above.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission

<u>Disclaimer</u> 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