

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		07/05/2010	
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		28/04/2010	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Rob Tulloch				2010/1578/P 2010/1585/C			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
3 Wadham Gardens London NW3 3DN				See decision notice			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
(i) Erection of ground and first floor extension to north-east side and single storey extension to rear following the demolition of existing single storey side and rear extension, creation of new basement with three lightwells, insertion of rooflights to side roof slope and other alterations to fenestration (Class C3). (ii) Demolition of existing single storey side and rear extension.							
Recommendation(s):		(i) Refuse Planning Permission (ii) Refuse Conservation Area Consent					
Application Type:		Householder Application Conservation Area Consent					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	24	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		24 neighbours were notified and a site notice displayed from 06/04/2010. No responses were received.					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		Elsworthy Residents Association welcomed the fact that the proposed extension would be built in matching materials and with similar fenestration to host building.					

Site Description

3 Wadham Gardens is a three storey detached house standing in a large garden, and occupying a prominent corner site on the north-east side of the junction of Wadham Gardens and Harley Road. It is constructed in majority red brick with clay pantile roofing, it is heavily but well proportioned with white painted joinery as a dominant feature. Particular features of the front (south-east) elevation facing Wadham Gardens are the two high Dutch-style gables and the high chimneys, particularly that flanking the side (north-eastern) wall of the property which bears its full height to the back garden of the property, and which is a visible feature in the street scene.

It is located within the Elsworthy Conservation Area and is listed as a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area.

Relevant History

Application Site

No relevant planning history

1 Wadham Gardens

PE9900611: Permission granted in Sept 1999 for “alterations of the existing dormer windows in the west and east elevations and the installation of new dormer windows in the east and north elevation and installation of two new roof windows”

PEX0100381: Permission granted in Dec 2001 for (abbrev.) “Demolition of existing extensions and erection of a replacement part two, part ground floor rear extension together with the formation of a part basement level and the erection of a new dormer window facing onto Wadham Gardens and rear elevation”

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 General design principles

B3 Alterations and extensions

B7 Conservation areas

T3 Pedestrians and cycling

T7 Off-street parking

T12 Works affecting highways

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Extensions and alterations

Elsworthy Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2009

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage

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 proposal involves:

- (1) the demolition of existing single storey side and rear extension and open porch/conservatory to the side elevation (north-east) and the erection of a two storey extension to the side (north-east) with pitched roof and dormer window;
- (2) a rear single storey infill extension;
- (3) a single storey basement extension with three lightwells;
- (4) replacement of a bay window on the side elevation (south-western) with French doors;
- (5) alterations to fenestration and installation of roof lights to side roofslope; and
- (6) alterations to boundary wall and installation of new entrance gates on Wadham Gardens frontage

Each of these elements is dealt with in order below. The main issues are the impact of the extension on the host building, street scene and conservation area, and on the amenity of adjoining occupiers.

Revisions

Revisions to the proposals were received in response to officers' advice that the proposed extension was too large. The changes, which only relate to the extension, include:

- The south east side elevation of the extension set back by 550mm so that the flank of the extension is set back 1200mm from the property's front building line
- North east rear elevation of the extension set back 500mm and including a narrower bay window (as opposed to folding doors)
- Lowering the ridge height of the extension by 500mm (allowing for the retention of the tiled stepped shoulder of the chimney on the side (north-east) elevation)
- Lowering the floor of the extension by 300mm thereby lowering the eaves line by 300mm
- Removal of the north east dormer
- Reduction in the size of the south-eastern dormer by 100mm in height

Design assessment

- (1) Demolition of existing north-east ground floor wing and conservatory and erection of new extension on north-east side of property:

The proposal involves the demolition of a flat roofed single storey brick extension measuring 6.5m (D) x 5.2m (W) x 4m (H) to the north-east of the property which appears to have been built to house the service areas at the same time as the main house, and the demolition of an existing open porch/conservatory measuring 1.8m (D) 4.5m (W) x 3m (H). The extension contains a coal store with fittings which appear contemporary with the house, a boiler room, and a walk-in larder. For this reason, it was always intended to appear subordinate to the principal portions of the property. However, since these elements of the property are now out-dated and of a utilitarian nature, there is no objection in principle to the demolition of the extension as long as alterations to make good the house or to extend the house are done in a sensitive fashion; this is of importance because the eastern elevation of the property is visible from the street. The open porch/conservatory is a small lightweight structure the removal of which would not harm the appearance of the building.

The Camden Planning Guidance (paras 19.19 – 19.21) requires side extensions not to be unduly prominent in the streetscape and subordinate to the main building and to not obscure original architectural features on flank walls. Policy B3 (Alterations and extensions) of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006 also requires extensions to respect the form, character and proportions of the building and its setting, be subordinate to the main building, and have regard for original architectural features. The Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (12.5, 12.6, and 12.8) similarly requires careful consideration with regard to extensions to existing building.

The revised two storey side extension measures approximately 7.5m in depth (reduced from 8m) x 10m wide (reduced from 10.5m) with eaves at 3m (reduced from approx 3.2m) and a pitched roof rising to 7.5m (reduced from 8m). This is still considered to be overly large, and would be highly visible, will harm long views along Wadham Gardens, and will be seen to be occupying a large portion of the amenity space of the house's garden. It is considered that the extension is too large in terms of footprint (width and depth) and height, and therefore fails to be subservient to the main house.

The large pitched roof is likely to give a 'barn-like' appearance due to the large floor area which it would cover across two floor levels. The roof form, with a ridge apex positioned roughly centrally on the side of the house, would sit uncomfortably against the existing building, most particularly the large, full-height chimney on the east wall which would be obscured in an unfortunate manner. The revised scheme would retain the stepped tiled detail on the chimney which is situated just above ground floor level. However this feature is only part of the chimney which is a prominent feature that contributes as a whole to the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene and the conservation area.

The proposed two dormer windows to the extension have been reduced to one on the side of the roof of the extension facing Wadham Gardens, and the white painted timber flanks have been replaced with lead cheeks. However, while remaining subservient to the roof, the dormer does not diminish the visual appearance or bulk of the roof sufficiently to make the side extension acceptable. The large width of the French windows would also take on an unprecedented scale in the context of the overall house and would not enhance the appearance of the building.

(2) Single storey rear extension:

The proposed single storey infill extension between the rear of the house and the boundary wall would be set back 500mm from the rear wall of the extension and measure 2.5m deep and 8.8m wide with a reduced height of 2.7m. It would not be visible from the street and be modest in size. Due to its size and location it is considered acceptable.

(3) Basement extension:

The proposed basement would measure 13.5 m x 19m and extend, approximately 6.5m under the garden with the rest being covered by the proposed extension. As the proposal seeks to replace the garden above the basement extension it is not considered that the visible manifestations of the basement (three lightwells) would impact negatively on the conservation area. The element with the most potential for visual impact is the lightwell proposed for the south side of the property, facing Wadham Gardens, but it has been treated in a minimalist way so as to avoid harm to the conservation area.

(4) Replacement of bay window facing Harley Road (south west) side:

The proposal includes the removal of the apron to the central portion of the bay window to create a door. The bay is an integral element of the original architecture and adheres to a traditional design and the alteration would not enhance the appearance of the building, and the may be visible from the street. As such it's the loss of the bay would be regrettable, but would not be a reason for refusal in itself. However, these works can be undertaken as permitted development.

(5) Alterations to fenestration and installation of roof lights to side roofslope:

The rear (north-west) elevation of the property is not highly visible due to its proximity to its neighbour in Harley Road. Therefore the introduction of a new first-floor window would have a limited visual impact. The relocation of the rear window (north-east side) over the existing rear ground floor projection with an adjacent cutaway in the roof would sit uncomfortably against the proposed extension, to the detriment of the appearance of the house which is very much in its original state and is highly visible within the conservation area. These works could be undertaken under permitted development and do not constitute a reason for refusal within themselves. The proposed rooflights would be fitted flush with the surface of the roof and are limited in number and size, thereby not harming the appearance of the building in long views down Wadham Gardens.

(6) New entrance gates and alterations to boundary treatment

No details of the proposed entrance gates have been provided. It is imperative that the design of new entrance gates is authentic with the Willett development in terms of overall design, layout, use of materials and finishes and detail. The boundary treatments in Wadham Gardens and Harley Road are a very significant feature in the conservation area. In the event of a future consent being granted, the detailed design of the proposed gates would need to be approved by the Council.

It is proposed to demolish a small stretch of this wall to allow for access in the event of a consent being granted. This would be acceptable provided that the rebuilt wall matched the existing in terms of

brick colour and type, brick bond and pointing technique.

Conclusion: Design Assessment

The applicants have cited the extension at No 1 Wadham Gardens as a viable precedent for this proposal. This property is also situated on a prominent corner, and the extension is highly visible from the street. The relevant extension is shown as existing on submitted drawings for the consent of 1999 (see site history above). The existing extension at No 1 and a later unimplemented consent (2001) for its demolition and redevelopment as a part two-storey, part one-storey extension are not considered as viable precedents for this application, as they pre-date current guidance and policies.

In their revised statement the applicant has also referred to other Willett houses in Wadham Gardens with side extensions with pitched roofs. These are actually on Elsworthy Road and have a much smaller footprint than what is proposed. No. 55 Elsworthy Road (Appendix 2 photo 2) is a similar height, but records show it was in existence before the conservation area was designated in 1973. No. 44 Elsworthy Road (Appendix 2 photo 4) is much more modest in terms of footprint and height, but there are no planning records to indicate when it was constructed.

In conclusion, whilst the other elements of the proposal are broadly acceptable, the two storey side extension is too large and fails to be subservient to the host building in terms of height, bulk, mass and detailed design. It would obscure and compromise significant architectural features on the host building to the detriment of the visual appearance of the building, contrary to policy B3 of the UDP. Furthermore its height, bulk and appearance would harm the immediate and longer views of the dwelling from Wadham Gardens, therefore failing to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Elsworthy Conservation Area, contrary to policy B7 of the UDP.

Trees

The tree survey and protection details are considered acceptable and would ensure the protection of trees to be retained on site. While the proposal involves the removal of a number of trees which provide a decent level of visual amenity and biodiversity within this part of the conservation area their removal is acceptable.

Amenity

The pitch of the roof of the extension, and its distance away from no. 9 Harley Road, mean that there will not be a significant loss of daylight or sunlight to the adjoining occupiers. The rear of the property faces the flank elevation of no. 9 Harley, the proposal includes three rooflights, and two small stained glass windows at rear first floor level, none of which are considered to increase overlooking or create a loss of privacy for the adjoining occupiers. The proposed dormer to the south-eastern roof slope of the extension would be approximately 27m away from no. 6 Wadham Gardens so would not increase overlooking or create a loss of privacy for the occupiers and therefore complies with policy SD6 of the UDP.

Other issues

The proposed sliding vehicle access gate is acceptable in transport terms because it has been designed in such a way that it will not open out onto the public highway. The proposal involves a creation of a new basement level which will require a large amount of earth excavation. However, as the existing building is being retained, the existing house will have to be underpinned. As these excavations will have to be done by hand the daily limit of material excavated will not be large. Therefore construction is likely to take a longer period of time, and the number of construction vehicles going to and from the site on a weekly basis will not be large. Given this 'spreading of the load' on the transport network, a construction management plan would not be necessary to mitigate the impact of the development on the transport network.

Recommendation

Refuse Planning Permission. Refuse Conservation Area Consent

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