

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	19/05/2010
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	20/04/2010
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Rob Tulloch			2010/1438/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
58a King Henry's Road London NW3 3RP			See decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Excavation of basement and erection of a two storey rear extension at basement and ground floor level to dwelling house (Class C3).				
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission		
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	08	No. of responses	07	No. of objections	07
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Seven responses were received from 56A, 56B, 56C, 56D, 56E, 58, and 58B King Henry's Road</p> <p>The main objections were to the roof extension and the fire escape:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the roof extension will be detrimental to the appearance of the terrace, and any roof extension should be done to the terrace as a whole the fire escape does not comply with building regulations, will compromise security, would be out of character, and cause a loss of light and privacy <p><u>Officer response</u> <i>The original proposal consisted of three elements, a roof extension, a two storey rear extension, and a rear fire escape leading from the proposed third floor to the top of the proposed rear extension. The applicant's have amended their proposal and removed the roof extension and fire escape from the proposal</i></p> <p>58 King Henry's Road further commented - No objection in principle to the two storey rear extension as long as a privacy screen is erected</p> <p><u>Officer response</u> <i>The roof extension and fire escape have been removed from the proposal, without the fire escape there would be no need for a privacy screen</i></p> <p>56A, B and C further objected about a potential loss of daylight and sunlight because the rear extension at 56D has caused a loss of light and privacy</p> <p><u>Officer response</u> <i>As the rear building line of 56-56E is 2.8m further back than the building line of 58-58D and a similarly size extension exists at 58 King Henry's Road, the proposed rear extension would not affect 56-56E as it would only be visible from the rear parts of their gardens.</i></p> <p>58B object - The rear extension would be taller than that at no. 58 and a there would be a potential loss of light from any balustrading that would accompany a future application for a terrace on top of the extension</p> <p><u>Officer response</u> <i>The proposed extension would be 400mm higher than the neighbouring extension but the terrace rises from 56-58D so 58A is 400mm higher than 58. Due to its location next to an existing extension and the difference in building lines between 56-56E and 58-58D it is not considered that there would be a significant loss of daylight to 58B. The application does not include balustrading or a terrace on top of the extension.</i></p>					

**CAAC/Local groups*
comments:**
*Please Specify

No responses received

Site Description

The site forms part of a terrace of 11 three storey houses on the north side of King Henry's Road which back on to London Overground and Network Rail railway lines. The terrace was built in the late 1960's in a modern style as part of the Chalcot Estate development. It is constructed in London stock brick with white timber cladding, first floor balconies, aluminium framed windows and integral garages. The site does not lie within a conservation area.

Relevant History

58 King Henry's Road (2007/4507/P) Lawful Development Certificate (proposed) granted 01/11/2007
Erection of two-storey rear extension at basement and ground floor level in connection with existing single-family dwellinghouse (Class C3).

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
B1 General design principles
B3 Alterations and extensions

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Extensions and alterations

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

DP24 Securing High Quality Design
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development
CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

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

The original proposal was for a roof extension, basement extension, two storey rear extension, and fire escape descending from the proposed third floor to the top of the rear extension.

Revision

As the terrace is largely unaltered, with no extensions at roof level, a roof extension would have been unacceptable in principle. The applicants amended their proposal and removed the roof extension and associated fire escape.

The amended proposal is for a basement extension under the existing footprint of the house with a basement and ground floor extension to the rear. The main issues are the impact of the extension on the host building and the impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Design considerations

The rear garden is approximately 8 metres in length. The ground level drops away towards the railway so the rear garden is between 2.2 and 3 metres lower than the ground floor of the house. The

basement extension would cover the existing footprint of the house and extend into the rear garden by 2.8 metres at basement level with a similar extension at ground floor level, creating a two storey rear extension measuring 2.8 metres deep, 5.2 metres wide and 5.4 metres high.

The extension would leave two storeys between its roof and the eaves of the existing house and although it is full-width it is considered to be subordinate to the host building in terms of bulk and scale. The rear gardens of the terrace are not long, and they slope steeply down toward the railway line and can only be accessed by stairs. Most houses, including the application site, have terraces at ground floor level that take up part of the garden to provide usable amenity space. Due to the proximity of the development to the railway line the applicant will be advised, via an informative, to contact Network Rail prior to commencing any works.

The basement would be modest in size, entirely within the existing footprint of the dwelling, and by virtue of the location and constraints of the site (mid-terrace property with no independent access to the rear) the construction process is likely to be undertaken slowly and manually. Therefore the excavation is unlikely to generate significant vehicle movements and the process may be managed without the need for a Construction Management Plan. Both adjoining neighbours state that they raise no objection to the basement works. Adjoining property 58 has undertaken structural work at basement level without apparent issues of stability. The basement proposals are generally in accordance with Camden guidance.

The extension would be rendered with almost full height, full width, aluminium framed sliding doors, as such the design and materials are considered to be acceptable. There is a similar extension next door at no. 58, and a ground floor extension at 56D which is of a similar height. The site is not in a conservation area and the rear of the terrace can only be seen from across the railway line, as such the proposal is not considered to harm the appearance of the host building or terrace.

Residential amenity

Although comments have been received from 56-56E King Henry's Road regarding loss of amenity, due to their building line extending further back than 58-58D King Henry's Road and an existing two storey extension at no. 58 between them, it is not considered that the proposal would affect 56-56E in terms of a loss of light or loss of privacy.

58 King Henry's Road has an extension of a similar height, depth and width which the proposed extension would abut. Therefore the proposed extension would not affect the amenity of no. 58 in terms of loss of light or privacy.

The proposed extension would be 800mm higher than the existing timber fencing surrounding the ground floor terrace, but would project 2.8 metres from the rear of the house, as opposed to the existing structure which projects 4.6 metres from the rear of the house. Therefore the proposed extension is not considered to cause a loss of light or privacy to adjoining occupiers.

Recommendation

Grant Planning Permission

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