

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		01/10/2010	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		14/09/2010	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Jonathan Markwell				2010/4260/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
1 Millfield Place Highgate London N6 6JP				Please see decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of single storey side conservatory extension at ground floor level to single family dwellinghouse (Class C3).							
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission					
Application Type:		Householder Application					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	26	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
				No. Electronic	01		
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>A site notice was erected on 18/08/2010, expiring on 08/09/2010. 21 neighbouring occupiers were formally consulted, together with five additional persons (not residing at the 21 neighbouring addresses) who commented on a previous application at the site (2010/2046/P – see relevant history below). A total of one response was received from an occupier at No. 2 Millfield Place, who is also the freehold owner of No. 2 Millfield Lane. This response included comments and objections to the proposals, summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) “We have no overall objections to the revised proposals...which do not affect the appearance and style of the existing property at 1 Millfield Place to an excessive extent”. b) The design of the proposed conservatory is however out of keeping with neighbouring properties (including in close proximity to the grade II listed 2 Millfield Place) and has a negative impact on the conservation area as a whole. c) Proximity to No. 2 Millfield Lane will cause light pollution and overlooking. d) No objection to roof works, providing they are implemented as shown. 					

e) Absolutely vital that a construction management plan is produced owing to cul-de-sac nature of Millfield Place and need for constant access to No's 2 and 3 Millfield Place.

Officer response: b) Please see section 3; c) Please see section 4; d) These elements have been omitted during the course of the application; e) Please see section 5.

CAAC/Local groups* comments:

*Please Specify

Highgate CAAC was formally consulted. No response has been received to date.

Site Description

The application site comprises a detached two-storey single dwellinghouse and associated gardens on the west side of Millfield Place. The application site is located on designated private open space as part of the gardens of properties on Millfield Place, which are on the eastern edge of Hampstead Heath. The application site building is not listed, but is located within Highgate Village Conservation Area. Within the conservation area statement the application site building is identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Within the statement the building is noted as "a solidly built interwar double-fronted house of two-storeys with a tiled pitched roof and small paned metal casement windows. It has a separate garage block employing a similar architectural vocabulary, situated in the former rear garden of No 15 Highgate West Hill".

The surrounding area comprises predominantly large dwellings set within generous grounds elsewhere on Millfield Place and on Millfield Lane (to the south). Millfield Place is a private lane which rises in level from south to north. To the north No. 2 is grade II listed and includes a large swimming pool within the garden area between this detached stucco villa and the application site. To the east are the rears of properties which front onto Highgate West Hill. To the south, beyond the garden of the host property, is No. 2 Millfield Lane, which includes a side entrance from Millfield Place. To the west, beyond the garden of the host property are the rear gardens of No's 4-10 Millfield Lane and No. 30 Millfield Lane.

Relevant History

2003/2618/P - Construction of a timber summerhouse in the garden. Refused 24/12/2003.

2008/4771/P - Erection of a replacement garage after the demolition of the existing garage. Granted 05/01/2009.

2010/2046/P - Erection of side and full width rear extensions at ground, first and roof level; excavation of new basement; increase in roof ridge height to enable a loft conversion with rear roof terrace inset with associated external and fenestration alterations; addition of new side glazed entrance to existing single dwelling house (Class C3). Withdrawn 13/07/2010.

Relevant policies

London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 - Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 - General design principles

B3 - Alterations and extensions

B6 - Listed buildings

B7 - Conservation areas

N2a - Protecting open space – Development on public and private open space

N8 - Ancient woodlands and trees

T12 - Works affecting highways

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Highgate Village Conservation Area Statement

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

The Inspector's Report into the Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies Development Plan documents ("DPD"s) was published on 13th September and found the policies in the DPDs to be sound. This means "considerable weight" can now be given to these LDF policies even though at this stage they have yet to be formally adopted by the Council. Where there is a conflict between UDP policies and these LDF policies the Planning Inspectorate

would consider it reasonable to follow the latter. However prior to formal adoption UDP policies should still be taken into account as the Council's adopted Development Plan.

LDF Core Strategy

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 biodiversity

LDF Development Policies

DP20 – Movement of goods and materials

DP21 – Development connecting to the highway network

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage

DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Assessment

1. Introduction

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a single storey side conservatory extension (on the south elevation) at ground floor level to this single family dwellinghouse (Class C3). The proposed extension is approximately 2m in width, 5.45m in depth and 3.35m in height.

1.2 During the course of the application, proposals to increase the roof ridge height and install a new dormer roof extension on the rear (west) elevation has been omitted and is no longer proposed; the side extension at ground floor level is the sole element of the proposals.

2. Land use principles

2.1 The application site is situated within designated private open space (as a garden area within a property within Millfield Place on the eastern edge of Hampstead Heath). Policy N2a of the UDP and CS15 of the LDF seeks to protect areas of designated open space, and states that the Council will not grant planning permission for the development of public or private open space unless it is for development ancillary to a use taking place on the land and for which there is a demonstrable need that cannot be reasonably satisfied elsewhere. In this instance the proposals involve what is considered to be a relatively small scale extension to an existing residential use on the site. The proposals therefore comply with the requirements of these policies. As such, there are no issues raised regarding the proposals in land-use terms.

3. Design

3.1 In relation to design matters, the proposed conservatory extension would be significantly (2.6m) set back from the front elevation of the building (which fronts onto Millfield Place) and is relatively modest in size (as denoted in paragraph 1.1 above). As such, this single storey conservatory extension is considered to be appropriate in general design terms, being clearly subordinate to the main house and not being seen as overly bulky or out of scale with the substantial host building. In addition, it would not be unduly prominent from Millfield Place owing to the vegetation and trees at this point. Furthermore, access to the rear amenity space would be retained. The urban grain in this particular location ensures that no important gaps or views through the site would be lost. In addition, the proposed plans show that the existing set of double doors and window at ground floor level on this south side elevation will be retained as existing as part of the proposals. This is considered to be welcomed, as it would allow the proposed works to be easily removed (if desired at a later date) without causing damage to the architectural integrity of the building as a whole.

3.2 It is acknowledged that the level of detail shown on the proposed plans is somewhat limited. However, in principle the proposed design is considered to be largely appropriate, with a lightweight design which is clearly subordinate to the main building and includes a number of critical window panes which align satisfactorily with the existing fenestration pattern at the building. Notwithstanding this, the success of the development is considered to be very much dependent upon precise execution and the appropriate use of high quality materials, detailed design and finished appearance.

Therefore it is considered appropriate to add a condition denoting that sample panels of all facing materials, including the window framing materials, are provided on site and approved by the Council prior to works being commenced. This is considered to be necessary in the absence of detailed plans and sections and will provide the Council with sufficient control over the quality of the finished scheme. This will thereby ensure that the character of the host building and wider conservation area is preserved.

4. Amenity

4.1 In respect of residential amenity, the application site is set on a large plot and is enclosed by a variety of vegetation on all sides both within and outside of the application site. This helps to mitigate any possible impact of loss of amenity to neighbours in terms of issues such as overlooking/loss of privacy, sense of enclosure/loss of outlook, noise/disturbance (including light spillage disturbance) and sunlight/daylight matters. More specifically, the neighbouring No. 2 Millfield Lane would be located a minimum of 16m away from the nearest part of the proposed conservatory. In this area between the two properties is a range of vegetation and trees associated with the gardens of both properties, which together with the distance involved is considered to downplay any significant loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers.

4.2 It is however considered necessary to add a condition denoting that the flat roof area created shall not be used as a roof terrace. This shall seek to protect the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers in terms of overlooking and privacy matters.

5. Transport

5.1 An objection has denoted that a Construction Management Plan (CMP) should be secured as part of any development at this site. However, owing to the small scale of the works proposed, it is considered that the anticipated intensity of works and construction traffic trips that would be generated from the proposed development does not warrant a CMP to be secured. The applicant has also indicated ownership on the site location plan of a garage building on the east side of Millfield Place, opposite the application building. This provides what is considered to be adequate space for vehicles to implement the proposed scheme without harming the access to other properties on Millfield Place. Thus a CMP is not considered to be required.

6. Trees/landscaping

6.1 An Arboricultural Report has been provided in support of the application. This report satisfactorily demonstrates that trees on or adjoining the site would not be detrimentally affected by the proposals (which are less in extent than the proposed works outlined in the Arboricultural Report submitted, which relates to the works proposed previously by application 2010/2024/P – see relevant history above) and can be sufficiently protected during the construction works. As a result, the proposals are considered to be appropriate in this regard.

7. Recommendation

7.1 Grant Planning Permission

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 27th September 2010.

For further information see

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