

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	19/07/2010
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	24/6/2010
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Hugh Miller			2010/2436/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
3 Raveley Street London NW5 2HX			See draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of a single storey rear extension to single-family dwelling house (Class C3).					
Recommendation(s):		Grant permission			
Application Type:		Householder Application			
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
Informatives:					

Consultations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	32	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	03
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p><u>15 Lambourn Close</u> – No comment.</p> <p><u>5a Raveley Street</u> – Object. Access is limited to half of the rear garden; proposed extension forming a new party wall would be higher than the existing wall; the extension would lose the charm and feeling of spaciousness between the properties; the extension would be higher than the shrubbery which will give the garden a feeling of being loomed over and hemmed in [<i>causing a sense of enclosure</i>]; extension closeness to kitchen window would have a negative impact on amenity;</p> <p><u>5B Raveley Street</u> – 2 x responses. Object. Extension will result in loss of privacy/ daylight & sunlight.</p> <p><i>Officer comments: See para. 3.0 below</i></p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	N/A.					

Site Description

The application site is located on the south east side of Raveley Street, south of Lupton Street and west of the junction with Lady Margaret Road. The site comprises a three storey mid-terraced property with two storey rear addition currently in occupation as a single family dwelling house. The rear of the site backs onto the car park in association a residential block known as 'Lanbourn Close'. The building is not listed or located in a conservation area.

Relevant History

May 2010- Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Development issued - Erection of a rear dormer to dwelling house (Class C3); ref. 2010/2444/P

December 2009 – PP Refused - Erection of second storey rear extension on top of existing roof terrace and replacement of existing roof terrace balustrade, in association with dwelling house (Class C3); ref. 2009/3741/P

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

B1-General design principles.

B3-Alterations & extensions

SD6 - Amenity for occupiers & neighbours

CPG 2006

Section 19: Extensions, alterations and conservatories

Draft LDF Core Strategy

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

CS1 – Distribution of growth

CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development

CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP24 –Securing high quality design

DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Assessment

1.0 Background

Current application

The application proposes the following:

- ✓ Erection of a single storey rear/side extension infilling side gap to dwelling house (Class C3).

The main concerns are: **a]** design and **b]** neighbour amenity.

2.0 Design

2.1 At the rear is located a 2-storey projecting wing including a roof terrace with railings. An “L” shaped hard and soft landscaped area forms the rear garden amenity space. The hard landscaped / patio area measure approximately 17.16sqm [2.6 x 6.6] and is characteristic of the terrace of properties. No.5 the adjacent dwellinghouse has a similar 2-storey rear wing with pitched roof plus an identical layout to its rear garden space. There is a 1.5m high common brick wall and green shrubbery that separate the patio area of the application site and no.5.

2.2 Revisions- The height of the extension's party wall along the boundary with no.5 has been reduced from 3.0m to 2.8m - although this would appear insignificant, it is considered that in this location having the lowest possible addition would ensure minimal impact on neighbouring occupiers. Under the previous GPDO, this proposal would have been deemed permitted development but now in its amended form, the new criteria do not allow rear extensions of more than 4m depth.

2.3 It is proposed to erect a single-storey side extension in the side alley which is full-depth aligning with the depth of the 2-storey wing. It would comprise framed aluminium folding /sliding glazed doors across the whole width of the enlarged rear elevation. The dimension of the extension is 2.8m height, 2.6m width and 6.6m depth. A green flat roof is proposed and it would include two sky/ rooflights set below the raised parapet. At the rear a zinc fascia would provide an anchor for the folding glazed doors, whilst matching brick would form the remainder of the new common boundary/party wall and rear elevation. The area of glazed doors ensures that the extension has a lightweight visual appearance which together emphasise the vertical window treatment on the upper rear elevation.

2.4 The proposed green roof is considered acceptable as it would not only provide new habitat but it would reduce the rate of storm water run-off and provide insulation for energy, as well as improving outlook from upper floor windows;

2.5 The proposed extension is considered subordinate to the host building in terms of its scale and proportions and is considered to comply with CPG guidelines. The proposed extension is not considered to harm the appearance of the building and would not detract from the character and appearance of the rear garden landscape. The proposed extension would not detract from the appearance of the building. In terms of design, materials and execution the extension is considered acceptable and accords with RUDP policies B1, B3 and CPG guidelines.

3.0 Neighbour amenity

3.1 The occupiers of 5a & 5b Raveley Street are concerned about loss of privacy, day/ sunlight and the sense of enclosure that is likely to occur from the proposed extension. Flat 5b is at first floor level and the proposed extension would not have any impact on the occupiers' amenity.

3.2 It should be noted however that the existing 2-storey rear wing of the host building measures 5.8m height x 6.0m depth and set back approx. 4.9m from the east flank wall of no.5. The closet wing therefore provides some screening to the rear garden space at no.5 and in particular the occupiers at ground floor flat (5a). Nevertheless, it is considered that the proposed single-storey extension would not harm occupiers' amenity at no.5a because of the new extension's height (2.8m) relative to the location of the patio/ garden space and the ground floor windows. It is unlikely that the proposed would cause additional loss of amenity to these occupiers because:

- a. the ground floor windows at no.5a are orientated due south and south-east. These windows provide views towards the existing 2-storey closet wing of the host building. To ascertain the impact of the proposed extension on daylight to no.5a, the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) measurement was analysed in accordance with the BRE daylight guide recommendations. It notes that the current VSC available to the ground floor rear bedroom window is 17% whereas with the new extension it will be 15.5%; similarly the side kitchen window has 16.5% and will have 16% after the new development. The difference between existing and proposed VSC for the rear window is only 9%, which is considered negligible in this location, particularly where the existing building footprint compromises the amount of day/sunlight available to no.5a. Similarly sunlight tests carried out

show that the loss of sunlight would be insignificant and less than the recommended 20% reduction. Officer observations at the site can concur that whilst the extension would be closer to the bedroom window at no.5a, its overall impact would be minimal as the 2.8m high boundary wall would not cause any significant material additional harm through loss of daylight or sunlight.

- b. the gap between no.5a and the proposed extension on the common boundary measures 2.3m. At this distance, the extension could be considered to be rather bulky, as well as visually dominant. The perception of harm to neighbour amenity is related to the proximity and orientation of the windows when judged against the extension's height that forms the new boundary. The existing wall plus trellis is approx 2m high; however in addition above this there is a thick and substantial semi-mature shrubbery on the boundary which is estimated to be at a height comparable to the proposed extension. Officers have viewed the situation from the objector's windows and consider that any diminution of views/outlook would not be so materially detrimental to warrant refusal of the application. In any event, the shrubbery will be retained as agreed between both neighbours. The proposed extension is 0.8m higher and this difference in height would not in this instance considered to cause a sense of enclosure and therefore the proposed is satisfactory.
- c. the proposed extension has no windows on its common boundary with no.5 and therefore no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur;
- d. the roof/ skylights would be set below the raised parapet and are located far away from the windows at no.5a therefore no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur;
- e. the opening of the rear elevation and the use of folding doors would not unduly lead to additional noise nuisance to occupiers of the neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

As noted above, a similar sized extension in this location would have been dealt with under the old GPDO as permitted development; the size and bulk of its is considered acceptable and it will be minimal impact on neighbouring occupiers' amenities, in terms of outlook, views, and daylight or sunlight. The reduction in height has ensured that the impact on the neighbour amenity would not be so materially detrimental to refuse planning permission.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 28th June 2010. For further information see

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