

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		14/06/2011	
(Members Briefing)		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		26/05/2011	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Jennifer Walsh				2011/1553/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
43 Pilgrims Lane London NW3 1SS				Please refer to draft decision notice			
<b>PO 3/4</b>		<b>Area Team Signature</b>		<b>C&amp;UD</b>		<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>	
<b>Proposals</b>							
Alterations and extension in connection with the conversion of two residential flats into one dwelling house (Class C3), including the replacement of existing two storey lower ground and raised ground floor rear extension with new two storey extension, replacement of windows and doors at lower ground floor and raised ground floor levels to side and rear, and replacement of three rooflights to rear 1st floor roof extension, raising the roof ridge of the existing side extension with the installation of a single enlarged rooflight.							
<b>Recommendation:</b>		<b>Grant Planning Permission</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Full Planning Permission</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>15</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 press notice was published on 28/04/2011 – 19/05/2011 &amp; a site notice was displayed from 21/04/2011 – 12/05/1984</p> <p><u>12 Willow Road</u> – comments and objects to the proposal;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rear elevation is highly visible from our property. No real object to the owners wish to alter the extension but do quibble with the statement that the current mansard roof is inappropriate as in Paris when most mansard roofs were constructed Orientalism was á la mode!</li> <li>Concerns with the assessment of flood risk – there is watercourse (Willow Road stream) which lies within 20m of this extension at the end of our back gardens encased a concrete pipe. There have been instances of flooding in our houses. There is no building management plan within the application. My concern is if any deeper foundations are installed the impact on flooding and the stream. (OFFICER COMMENT: <i>An assessment on the impact of a proposed development on ground water flow, land stability and flood risk are only requested where the excavation of a new basement or an extension to an existing basement is proposed. This proposal involves the reconstruction of an existing two storey extension therefore further assessment is not considered</i></li> </ul>					

	<p>necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns with the extent of building works within the area. Residents need to know where plant and machinery are to be stored, what efforts there will be to contain the dust and loss of parking spaces to construction vehicles.. (OFFICER COMMENT: <i>An informative would be added regarding the noise from demolition and construction works under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. Furthermore the Council cannot refuse planning permission based on the numbers of other developments taking place in the area. An informative would also be added reminding the applicant that the works are subject to control under Building Regulations. Construction vehicles would be restricted by the same parking controls as any other vehicles. It is considered a Construction Management Plan would not be required for a development of this size and nature</i>)</li> </ul>
--	---

<b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b>	Hampstead CAAC have no objections to the proposal
------------------------------------	---

**Site Description**

The application site is a prominent three storey house with basement level which is currently accessed from the street level. The building is a white painted render and the front elevation is decorated with Islamic patterning and motifs. The building is currently arranged as two dwellings. The building is not a listed building, but it is noted as being a positive building within the Hampstead Conservation Area.

**Relevant History**

None relevant

**Relevant policies**

**LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

- CS1 (Distribution of growth)
- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
- CS6 (Providing quality homes)
- CS8 (Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy)
- CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)
- CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy)
- DP2 (Making full use of Camden’s capacity for housing)
- DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes)
- DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)
- DP24 (Securing high quality design)
- DP25 (Conserving Camden’s heritage)
- DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

**Camden Planning Guidance 2011 and 2006**

**Assessment**

**1. Proposal**

- 1.1. The application seeks permission for the change of use from two units (currently arranged as a basement flat and a maisonette serving the upper levels) and associated alterations to include:
- Reconstruction of the existing rear two storey extension removing the existing slate pitched roof and replacing it with a two storey square extension which echoes the design of the existing projecting wing the rear of the house;
  - Increasing the height of the parapet to the existing side extension and installation of a larger rooflight;
  - Alterations to the existing fenestration details of the application site to the side and rear elevations;
- 1.2 Revisions to the application have been received which include annotations to the proposed plans to show that the replacement rear first floor extension is to be finished in a white render material to match the existing situation.

## **2. Change of use**

- 2.1. The application seeks permission for the conversion of the 2 flats into a single dwelling house. The proposal would result in only the loss of one net dwelling and is consistent with Policy DP2 which resists the loss of two or more units in certain parts of the borough.
- 2.2. The application would result in the creation of a family sized unit which remains consistent with CS6 and DP5. The conversion has the potential to reduce the demand for car parking on Pilgrims Lane and therefore it is considered unreasonable to seek to secure the resulting dwelling as car-free.
- 2.3. As the loss of one unit is consistent with Camden's planning policy, the proposal is considered acceptable in this instance.

## **3. Design**

- 3.1. The height of the proposed rear extension is 3m (matching that of the height of the existing extension) and creating an overall height of 5.9m on the rear. The depth of the first floor addition is to be increased due to the proposal to remove the existing mansard roof element and replacing it with an extension which extends upwards from the rear elevation of the basement extension. The proposal is not visible from the public realm and therefore it is considered that the addition would not have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity of the streetscene or wider conservation area.
- 3.2. Council guidance expects extensions to be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, proportions, dimensions and detailing in this instance. The extension is considered to be subordinate to the host building and is one storey less than the highest storey of the host property. It is considered the removal of the solid slate covered 1970s rear addition and replacing it with a rendered extension to match the existing building will reduce the dominance of the addition. The proposed design allows it to be read as an addition on the host building thus lessening the perceived massing and bulk.
- 3.3. To the side of the application site there is an existing extension which includes a lightwell allowing light into the basement level closest to the main building with the extension then projecting 7.3m to the rear. The side extension is split into two elements. One which has a sloping roof and projects 3.2m and then the extension steps up by 0.5m to form a flat roof element projecting a further 4.1m's. It is proposed to remove the existing sloping roof element and raise the parapet by 0.5m to match the height of the rear element of the side extension creating a side extension with a flat roof. A large roof light 6m x 0.4m is proposed to be inserted within this flat roof to provide additional light to the rear element. Due to the small scale of the proposal to the existing extension and the design of the roof screening views of the rooflights, the proposed alterations to the side extension are not considered to harm the appearance of the host dwelling or the wider conservation area. The proposed extension of the roof is not considered excessive and the side extension will remain subordinate and complimentary to the main dwelling.
- 3.4. The other alterations to the property relate to alterations to the existing fenestration details of the property. The works can be summarised as follows:
  - Installation of timber door and window to the side elevation and rear of the proposed first floor extension;
  - Installation of large timber doors to the rear elevation at basement level, replacing two windows and a door to open up onto the private space to the rear of the property;
  - Dropping the cills of the existing windows to the side elevation of the host property at first floor level to create larger timber windows at this level;
  - Installation of a full height window to the side elevation at basement level facing the existing lightwell;
  - Creation of a window and door opening into the existing lightwell at basement level from the proposed kitchen;

- 3.5 It is considered that as the proposals include alterations to existing openings, it is not considered that the alterations (including dropping the cills of the existing timber windows) would have a detrimental impact on the host property nor the wider conservation area. Many of the alterations are at basement level and would not be visible from private nor public vantage points. The proposals maintain the proportions of the dwelling house and therefore are considered to be inline with policy in this instance.
- 3.6 As such the proposed rear extension, addition to the side extension and the alterations to the fenestrations are considered to comply with core policy CS14 and development policies DP24 and 25.

#### **4. Amenity**

- 4.1. As the proposal involves the replacement of an existing extension at first floor level, it is not considered that there would be any additional harm to the neighbouring outlook or resulting loss of sunlight or daylight to neighbouring habitable rooms, or the rear garden due to the height and bulk not being drastically increased. It is also considered that increasing the parapet wall to the side elevation would not harm the neighbouring properties in Worsley Court because of the minimal height increase and the presence of a plastic/timber conservatory/covered area at the boundary adjacent to the extension.
- 4.2. The proposed alterations to the existing side extension and erection of the replacement rear extension are not considered to harm the appearance of the host building the steetscene or the conservation area or to detrimentally affect the amenities of neighbouring properties and are therefore considered consistent with planning policy in this instance.

**Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission**

#### **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/>