

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>14/06/2011</b>	
<b>(Members Briefing)</b>		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>26/5/11</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Alan Wito				2011/1462/P 2011/1446/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
35 Downshire Hill London NW3 1NU				See decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
<b>Planning Permission</b> - Erection of a single storey extension at ground floor level to rear elevation, with external additions and alterations to include the installation of 2 x sash window and door to ground floor side elevation of existing house (Class C3)							
<b>Listed Building Consent</b> - Erection of a single storey extension at ground floor level to rear elevation, with external additions and alterations to include the installation of 2 x sash window and door to ground floor side elevation of existing house (Class C3)							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant Planning Permission</b> <b>Grant Listed Building Consent</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Householder Application</b> <b>Listed Building Consent</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>04</b>	No. of responses	<b>01</b>	No. of objections	<b>01</b>
				No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>A site notice was put up outside of the property from 27/4/11 to 18/5/11 and a notice was published in the Ham &amp; High on 5/5/11 with responses due by 26/5/11.</p> <p>A letter was received from the occupant of the neighbouring property at 36 Downshire Hill objecting the proposed extension and raising the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ambiguity of the size of the proposed extension as the application statement (3.65m<sup>2</sup>), design and access statement (6.75m<sup>2</sup>) and PPS statement (4.5m<sup>2</sup>) all give differing figures.</li> </ul>					

	<p><i>Response: The application form states that the amount of the building <u>to be demolished</u> (to make a new opening to the extension) would be 3.65m<sup>3</sup>. The design and access statement figure is for the size of the extension at 6.57m<sup>2</sup>. The PPS statement gives the internal floor area of the extension at 4.5m<sup>2</sup>. The applicant has confirmed that the 6.57 m<sup>2</sup> is incorrect and should be 6.05 m<sup>2</sup>.</i></p> <p><i>The differences in the two figures are due to the one being the measurement to the external face of the extension and the other being the internal floor area which does not include the thickness of the walls. The architects have clearly marked the dimensions on the drawings for clarity. The extension would have to conform with the drawings as opposed to the figures stated in the supporting statements.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objection on the impact on the impact on the setting the listed building in a conservation area, particularly the increased amount of glazing It is also stated that extension is visible from the garden of 36 Downshire Hill and from a number of rear windows in Keats Grove and South End Road.</li> </ul> <p><i>Response: The design and impact of the extension is assessed below.</i></p>
<p><b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> *Please Specify</p>	<p>Hampstead CAAC responded on 10/5/11 but made no objection.</p> <p>The Heath and Hampstead Society responded on 9/5/11 objecting to the proposal on the grounds that the design was incongruous in relation to the existing house, particularly the pitched roof form, thus damaging the architecture of the listed house. The Society thought the application should be refused.</p> <p><i>Response: The design and impact of the extension is assessed below.</i></p>

## Site Description

A Grade II two storey plus basement building on the south east side of Downshire Hill. It is one of a pair (with No. 34) of 19<sup>th</sup> Century semi-detached houses designed to appear as one house. It is in use as a single family dwelling house.

It lies within Hampstead Conservation Area and the back garden is also designated under the LDF as private open space 217 (along with the gardens on Keats Grove, South End Road Downshire Hill).

An Article 4 Direction is in place which removes the right to paint the external brickwork under permitted development.

## Relevant History

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted on 9/11/05 for the demolition of part 2, part 3 storey side extension and replacement with new part 2, part 3 storey side extension, demolition of existing single storey rear lean-to and erection of new lean-to to match the existing, alterations to the single storey studio building in the rear garden, insertion of timber stairs and railings to the front lightwell, erection of a new lantern and gate to the front boundary and internal alterations to the single family dwelling house (refs: 2005//3425/P and 2005/3426/L).

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted on 20/4/07 for the erection of a garden wall and greenhouse in the rear garden of the dwelling house on the boundary with No.34 (refs: 2007/0510/P and 2007/0511/L).

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### Core Strategies

CS1 - Distribution of growth

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS15 – Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging diversity

#### Development Policies

DP24 - Securing high quality design

DP25 - Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

**Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

**Camden Planning Guidance 2006**

**Hampstead Conservation Area Statement**

## Assessment

### Original proposal

The submitted scheme proposed the erection of small, single storey extension (6.05m<sup>2</sup>) to the side of the existing single storey rear wing at basement level. The extension matched the existing in terms of the fenestration but had a pitched lead roof. Internally a large opening was proposed in the rear wall to link the new extension with the existing building.

It is this scheme which the two objections are based on.

### Revised plans

Following comments raised by officers the design of the roof was altered. It is now proposed to be covered in slate. The pitch of the roof has been altered to match the adjacent slope on the rear wing although a section of flat roof is required to avoid covering over the window cill of the first floor.

The opening in the rear wall has been reduced to 2.2 metres in width.

### Assessment

#### *Impact on listed building and conservation area*

Views of the extension are extremely limited as the existing rear wing would block out views from the properties on South End Road. Limited views would be possible from the upper floors of the properties on Keats Grove but these are partly obscured by trees and plants in the rear gardens. Limited views would be possible over the garden wall of 36 Downshire Hill.

The proposed extension is small in scale, single storey and located at the rear at garden level. It is therefore considered entirely subservient to the host building and the adjacent rear wing. The design uses the same detailing as the existing rear wing, that is brickwork at a low level, timber doors and horizontal sashes and a pitched roof covered in slate. The pitch of the roof has been altered to match the adjacent slope on the rear wing which means that it now sits harmoniously with this structure. The design, which features large expanses of glazing, reads as small winter garden which is an appropriate design in the garden context.

The existing rear wing was rebuilt under the 2005 permissions. It is noted that the Yorkshire runner sash windows were re-used in that scheme and it is now annotated on the proposed drawings that these will be re-used again. Therefore, except for the loss of a small section of the rear wall the amount of historic fabric lost will be minimal.

#### *Internal alterations*

An enlarged opening is made in the rear wall to link the main house with the new space. The size of

the opening has been reduced (from the original proposal) to 2.2 metres which allows more of the rear wall to be expressed and allows the proportions of the main rear room to be clearly discerned and differentiates the two spaces (originally, one large space was proposed).

#### *Private open space*

Policy CS15 generally resists development on open spaces designated in the LDF. However paragraph 15.6 of the core strategy does make exemptions where development is ancillary to the use taking place on the land and for which there is a demonstrable need. Additionally it states that extensions should be proportionate to the size, including volume, of the original building.

The extension covers 6.05m<sup>2</sup> and covers only a negligible area of the rear garden to the property, let alone the overall size of the entire area of the private open space. The impact of the development will not appreciably erode the sense of openness which the private open space provides. Its use would be for a reading room which would be ancillary to the residential use of the building. In terms of justification the existing reading space is narrow and has no direct facing southern windows means that the space not well used. Therefore the proposed development is considered to comply with the requirements of policy CS15.

#### *Amenity*

It is considered that the proposed developments and alterations would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers or residents in comparison to the existing situation. The new area of glazing will be only 1.6 metres closer to 36 Downshire Hill but would not look directly into any window and would be largely screen by the high boundary wall between the properties.

#### *Trees*

A single tree protected by a Tree Preservation Order exists in the rear garden but it is too far away from the proposed extension to be affected by it.

#### **Recommendation**

The proposed extension is considered to comply with LDF policies. It preserves both the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area, therefore it is recommended that both planning permission and listed building consent is granted.

#### **DISCLAIMER**

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 13<sup>th</sup> June 2011.**

**For further information see**

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