

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	30/08/2010
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	6/8/2010
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Hugh Miller			2010/3369/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
22 Dartmouth Park Road London NW5 1SX			See draft decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of single storey rear extension at lower ground level to existing single dwelling house (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):	Grant			
Application Type:	Householder Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	16	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site Notice displayed 7/7/2010, expires 28/7/2010. No response.</p> <p><u>1 Laurier Court</u> – 2 X responses – No Comments.</p> <p><u>20 Dartmouth Park Road</u>. Object.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern that the proposed modern window to the rear closet wing is not in keeping with the traditional brick elevation of the property in the conservation area and is “also counter to the planning guidance we were given when we were applying for our own rear elevation planning permission in 2008”. ▪ New window will cause overlooking and loss of privacy; ▪ Concern about the loss of the Silver birch tree; its removal is base on cosmetic reasons – as it has no signs of disease; ▪ Concern that drawings imply that the finished floor level of the new extension is slightly below the level of the existing floor. Please have this clarified – the application is not for any excavation below existing floor level. <p>Officer Comment: Window alterations - See paragraph 1.3 below. Overlooking & loss of privacy – Section 3, Loss of the Silver birch tree – Para. 2.1 & 3.1 (4). Excavation – Para. 1.2</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p><u>Dartmouth Park CAAC</u>: Comment</p> <p>For the record, DPCA realizes that such a strong precedent has been set by the construction at number 20 Dartmouth Park Road that it would be entirely pointless to object to this particular application. We objected to the application for no 20 and all our reasons have therefore been noted in previous correspondence. We have considerable concerns about the sensitive issue of excavation. In fact this application is being filed by someone who in the past appeared to have shared these concerns.</p> <p>Officer Comment: First, each application must be considered on its merits. Second, with the exception of the picture-frame windows to the closet wing, the proposed extension is of contemporary design and is similar in most respects to that at no.20 in regards to location, height, length and use of materials. The substantive excavation relates to the raised upper rear garden between the common boundary and the east flank wall of the closet wing unlike the full excavation of the footprint of the main house at no.20 for the new sub-basement. Moreover, the proposed excavation and the excavation carried out at recently at no.20 is therefore not comparable in terms the impact on neighbouring residential occupiers or on the character and appearance of Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. Excavation – See Para. 1.2</p>					

Site Description

A semi-detached lower ground floor plus 3-storey semi-detached building including 2-storey closet wing located on the north side of Dartmouth Park, east of the junction with Boscastle Road and west of the junction with Laurier Road. The building forms one of a pair (the other being No. 20), which itself is one of 5 pairs semi-detached houses on this section of Dartmouth Park Road.

To the west of the application building, part single-storey and part 2-storey rear additions are characteristic of the properties (nos.12 –18) and they also vary in their depth. The application building no.22 and those to the east, nos.24-30 all have basement plus ground floor rear closet wings of identical height and depth. The application building is located in the Dartmouth Park C.A. It is not listed but is identified as to making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Relevant History

No.22 Dartmouth Park Road

None

No. 20 Dartmouth Park Road

April 2007- PP granted - Erection of a single-storey extensions at the rear and the side to single-family dwelling house (Class C3); ref. 2007/0224/P.

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation areas

N8 – Ancient Woodlands and trees

CPG 2006: Extensions, alterations and conservatories; Overlooking & privacy

Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement

Draft LDF Core Strategy

The following policies in the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have been taken into consideration

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage / conservation areas

CS15 - Ancient Woodlands and trees

DP24 – Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

As the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have now been published, they are material planning considerations. However, as a matter of law, limited weight should be attached to them at this stage.

Assessment

This application proposes the following:

- Erection of single storey rear extension at lower ground level to existing single dwelling house (Class C3).

In April 2007, the Council granted planning permission for a similar contemporary designed single-storey extension at the rear, lower ground level at no.20 Dartmouth Park Road, the neighbouring building. In fact this extension has been substantially built as can be seen from the supporting DAS document submitted by the applicant and during the officer site visit.

The key issues are, 1] design, 2] impact on the appearance of the building and on the appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, 3] tree considerations and 4] neighbour amenity.

1.0 Design

1.1 The dimensions of the proposed extension are 4.35m in width (infilling the existing lower terrace area to make the overall lower ground floor level full width), 5m in depth (aligning with the depth of the existing lower ground floor closet wing) and 3m in height; excluding the raised rooflight and raised parapet. It would set below and abuts the common boundary wall with no.20 and it would align with no.20's newly built extension. The proposed would also align with the length of the existing 2-storey closet wing at the host property. The roof of the proposed extension would ostensibly be a flat roof on the perimeter with felt roof covering and a glazed rooflight. This rooflight would be opaque glazed and occupy most of the roof surface, with a marginal slope and project approximately 400mm & 500mm above the roof/ parapet and common boundary wall. The rear elevation would comprise matching brick (salvaged from the closet wing) and aluminium framed glazed sliding doors.

1.2 The extent of excavation works required for this extension equates to an area 1m depth, 2.5m length and 4.35m in width; Furthermore, the new hard and soft landscaped rear garden would also require excavation 1m in depth across an area 4.2m in length and 6.9m in width (width of the extension and existing closet wing). The level of excavation works is considered to be relatively minor in nature and raises no design issues on its own.

1.3 Alterations are also proposed to integrate the elevation of the proposed extension with the existing closet wing. This would comprise the bricking-up of the existing door at the upper ground level west elevation and the installation of picture-frame windows would replace the existing windows on the rear (north) elevation and formation of new picture-frame window on the side (west) elevation, upper ground floor level. The alterations are considered minor and in themselves would not harm the appearance of the host building. Moreover, the picture-frame windows would not be visible from the public realm. In terms of design, materials and execution the amalgamation of the rear elevation creates harmony whilst separating the original built form from the new addition. Furthermore, the simple clean lines, vertical and horizontal emphasis are considered to reinforce the subordinate impact of the extension when compared with main building.

1.4 The proposed extension benefits from its contemporary design interplay with its varied height, rhythm of solid and lightweight transparent appearance, use of materials, scale and proportions. It also benefits from the interaction with the linked glazed elevation of the closet wing. Although having a staggered height, it would not only match the contemporary simplicity of the neighbouring extension but is considered to enhance the glazed and solid areas of the host building with harmony and crispness; thus ensuring that the altered and new extension remains subordinate whilst preserving the priority on the main elevation and creating an hierarchy with the window openings.

1.5 As a contemporary addition, the proposed extension is therefore in overall terms considered to be subordinate to the host building and would not be materially detrimental to its appearance. The proposed is also not considered to cause harm to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and it accords with policies B1, B3, B7 and CPG guidelines.

2.0 Tree

2.1 The rear garden features hard and soft landscaping, mature trees and green shrubbery and is considered to have a satisfactory amenity value. The proposed hard and soft landscaping works in association with the new extension would involve the removal of a mature Silver birch tree that lies approximately 1.5m from the rear elevation of the closet wing. The applicant states that they would provide an alternative tree to be planted elsewhere within the rear garden and officers raise no objection to this approach. The existing tree is not considered to meet the TPO criteria and thus its removal raises no objection. However, it is considered necessary for a condition to be attached to ensure that this replacement tree is actually planted.

3.0 Neighbour amenity

3.1 The proposed extension is not considered to significantly impact neighbouring properties, in particular occupiers at no.20 Dartmouth Park Road that lies due west of the host building for reasons as follows:

- 1) The common boundary wall with no.20 measures approx. 3.3m in height and excluding the raised rooflight and parapet, the proposed extension would set below the common boundary wall. The proposed extension would not cause an additional overlooking or loss of privacy; neither would it cause loss of day/sunlight to the occupiers;
- 2) At no.20, the upper ground level, there is a small obscure glazed window that is orientated due east; it is associated with the bathroom of that property. Currently, the occupiers of the host building have clear views of the bathroom window from the closet wings rear side door and the landing / steps on entering or leaving their rear garden. There is also clear views of the recently constructed lower ground extension and the rear garden of no.20 from the rear windows of the upper floor levels. Given the existing circumstances, and in absence of any adopted Council policy protecting views into rear gardens, it is clear that there is no loss of amenity for occupiers at no.20 from those works proposed in this application;
- 3) A picture window is proposed at upper ground level on the western flank wall of the 2-storey closet wing, and although it would be visible from no.20, it would by no means impact on occupiers amenity because **a]** the acute angles of view to the rear of no.20, and **b]** the picture window would be set behind a double-height internal void space with no direct floor access and consequently no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur to occupiers at no.20 opposite;
- 4) It is considered that the short-term loss of amenity value resulting from the removal of the Silver birch tree would not be significant for reasons explained above;
- 5) Party wall issues are a civil matter between the applicant and neighbour and a consideration for Building Control, it is therefore not a material consideration.

3.2 Finally, with the exception of the picture-frame window at the upper ground floor level (as explained above), the proposed extension would not cause a loss of amenity to neighbouring occupiers and does not appear excessively bulky in relation to the original property.

4.0 Recommendation: Approval is recommended.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 23rd August 2010. For further information see

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