

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		17/05/2010	
Members' briefing				<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		03/05/2010	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Jenny Fisher				2010/1405/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
119 King Henry's Road London NW3 3RB							
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>				
<b>Proposal(s)</b>							
Erection of single storey, ground floor rear extension to residential flat (Class C3).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission with conditions					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Householder Application					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	14	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	01
				No. electronic	00		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>A Letter of objection has been submitted from the occupant of the ground floor of 117 King Henry's Road and another on their behalf.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>anticipate overshadowing;</li> <li>sense of enclosure;</li> <li>too deep into garden, too close to boundary;</li> <li>no materials mentioned;</li> <li>would not be subordinate to original building, out of scale;</li> <li>daylight/sunlight should be addressed</li> </ul> <p><i>Officer comment</i> No overshadowing or sense of enclosure. Would not be too deep in the garden and a gap would be retained between the side elevation and boundary fence. Materials are referred to on the drawing submitted and on the application form. No sunlight/daylight impact. Merits of the design are discussed in detail in assessment below</p>					
<b>CAAC/Local groups* comments:</b> <small>*Please Specify</small>		<p><u>Elsworthy CAAC object</u> Object to width and projection of proposed extension which would alter the appearance and character of the rear elevation and would not relate successfully to the bay window at ground level.</p> <p><i>Officer comment</i> Merits of the design are discussed in detail in the assessment below. .</p>					

## Site Description

The lower ground floor flat of a basement plus 3 upper floors and accommodation in the loft space semi-detached property on the east side of King Henry's Road. The building comprises a number of self-contained flats.

The lower ground floor flat (application premises) is accessed via a narrow passage to the side of the building to a door in the side elevation and further along to the rear garden.

The property is located in the Elsworthy Conservation Area.

## Relevant History

### 121 King Henry's Road NW3

5/09/1994 (9400620) Approved

Works to form a 3-bedroom flat at lower ground floor level and a 2-bedroom flat at ground floor level including the erection of a single storey rear extension and two-storey side extension

### 123A King Henry's Road

04/06/2001 (PEX0000972) Approved

The erection of a single storey infill conservatory extension with glazed roof on the east elevation

## Relevant policies

### Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 (amenity); B1(alterations); B3 (extensions); B7(conservation area); N8 (protect trees)

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

*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.*

*CS15(protecting open spaces), DP29 (improve access), CS5 (manage impact of growth), DP26 (manage impact of development on neighbours), DP22 (sustainable design), CC13 (higher environmental standards), CS14 (conserve heritage), DP24 (secure high quality design), DP25(conserve Camden's heritage)*

### Camden Planning Guidance

### Elsworthy Conservation Area Statement

## Assessment

### Proposed

Erection of a single storey rear extension. It would extend 3.7m. from the rear elevation of the original building. It would be full width including a small recessed area to one side of the existing building. The height of the extension would be the same as the existing bay extension. A bay window would be installed to reflect the existing shape of the rear building line.

To the side the existing entrance door would be re-located but it would remain in the side elevation. An additional window would be installed.

Side access from the front of the house to the rear garden would be retained. The extension would cover what is currently a concrete patio area. It would not extend far enough to have an impact on an existing magnolia tree to one side of the garden.

Materials would match existing, bricks with a white painted render to the bay. Window and door frames would be white painted timber.

Main issues for consideration are visual and amenity impact

#### Visual impact:

What is proposed is similar to a rear extension approved in 2001 for No. 123 King Henry's Road. It would be difficult to get a clear view of it from anywhere other than the rear gardens of the application premises. A person standing at the bay window at rear ground floor level of the premises would see the edge of the roof but views of the garden which is a substantial length would not be restricted. The rear building line of the proposed extension would align with the ground floor extension to the rear of the adjoining property No. 121.

To the other side a gap between the side elevation of the lower ground floor flat and the boundary fence with No. 117 would be retained.

It is considered that the extension would not adversely affect the appearance of the building or character and appearance of the conservation area in line with UDP policies B1, B3 and B7.

#### Amenity:

The garden is a considerable length(27m.) The proposed extension would not compromise the amenity value of the garden for the occupants of the application premises and neighbours who overlook the green space.

The additional window in flank wall would be to a bathroom it would face a brick built boundary wall and a blind flank wall to No. 117, therefore no privacy implications. There would be no adverse impact to No.117 by reason of loss of natural light, overshadowing or overlooking.

#### Conclusion:

The rear extension would respect the architectural style of the original building including the bay that would be retained. It would be a subordinate addition to the property and allow for the retention of a reasonable sized garden. There would be no adverse impact to the amenity of occupants of flats on the upper floors of the property or those in adjoining and adjacent properties.

#### Recommend:

Approval with conditions

### **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613***