

**DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> April 2010. For further information see

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

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>	<b>Expiry Date:</b>	12/04/2010
		N/A / attached	<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	24/03/2010
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Elizabeth Beaumont			2010/0923/P	
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
7 Chetwynd Road London NW5 1BX			Please refer to decision notice	
<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 rear extension at ground floor level to single family dwelling house (use class C3).				
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>	Grant planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of responses	04	No. of objections	02
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p><b>No. 9 – Supports the application</b> – It appears to be very similar to the extension at nos. 17 and 15. There is no doubt that the property needs renovation and that the extension would improve the look of the property from the rear and help the applicants use the property as a family home.</p> <p><b>No. 45 Twisden Road</b> – Supports the application –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ This is just the type of subtle and respectful architectural approach that Camden should be supporting.</li><li>○ Shows how a single family dwelling house can be successful extension, while being subordinate to the historic context and respectful of neighbouring dwellings and residents.</li><li>○ Choice of materials is very well considered and complimentary to the surroundings.</li></ul> <p><b>Ground floor flat no. 5</b> – objects for the following reasons - Loss of daylight/sunlight on side and rear of flat. (Please refer to 3-3.5) If the wall height can be lowered it would be preferable, however as the proposal stands I object.</p> <p><b><i>Additional comments received on the 09/04/2010 from the occupier of no. 5, requesting that their objections be withdrawn. The occupier was satisfied that the increase in height of the proposed garden wall would not result in a detrimental loss of daylight to the garden flat.</i></b></p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p><b>Chetwynd &amp; Twisden Roads Residents Association</b> – Object for the following reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Permitted development for this type of infill extension was disallowed in 2008 as there was loss of amenity. (Please refer to 3-3.4)</li><li>○ There will be loss of amenity to neighbour for the following reasons;<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Visual intrusion – the garden wall will be increased by 300m. At a higher floor level than the proposed extension there will be a clear view of the glass roof which will be illuminated at night will be a visual intrusion. (Please refer to 3-3.5)</li><li>○ From the garden of no. 5 the large areas of glazing on the back on the extension and the new window will have a significant visual impact especially at night. (Please refer to 3-3.5)</li></ul></li><li>○ Light pollution – the first floor window on the back elevation of no. 5 will be affected by light pollution and all other upper windows.</li></ul>					

	<p>The level of height will be substantial and is unacceptable. (Please refer to 3-3.5)</p> <p><b>Dartmouth Park CAAC</b> – to date no response received.</p>
--	---

## Site Description

The site is located on the west side of Chetwynd Road close to the junction with Twisden Road. The site comprises a three storey single family dwelling house with two storey and single storey rear addition. The building is located in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area but is not listed.

## Relevant History

None relevant

## Relevant policies

### Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 – Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

B1 – General design principles

B3 – Alterations and extensions

B7 – Conservation Areas

### Camden Planning Guidance 2006

### Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Statement

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

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), (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

### 1 Proposal

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the following;

- The erection of an entirely glazed side glazed extension in between the existing boundary wall and the two storey rear addition in order to create additional space for the single family dwelling house.
- The boundary wall between no. 7 and 5 would be increased by 0.3m and would form the side elevation of the extension. The garden level would be lowered by 0.2m.
- The extension would measure 6.7m deep, 1.7m wide and 3m high sloping down to 2.4m (the same height as the wall). The roof of the extension would be sloped at an angle of 20°.
- The glazed extension would be set back from the building line of the two storey rear addition by 0.8m.

- Permission is also sought to insert a large frameless glazed window in the rear elevation of the rear addition.

## 2 Design

- 2.1 The roof of the proposed glazed extension has been sloped in order to replicate the existing roof profile of the two and single storey rear addition. The use of glazing rather than masonry ensures that the original 'L' shaped plan form can be clearly read. The proposal is considered to be of a modern approach which is an appropriate addition to the host building.
- 2.2 The extension would protrude above the boundary wall but only at a sloped angle, increasing in height away from the boundary and has been stepped away from the rear building line. It is considered that the extension would be subordinate to the host building in terms of scale and bulk.
- 2.3 The proposed addition of a frameless window in the rear elevation of the single storey rear addition would not involve the loss of any architectural features and it is considered that the addition would not detract from the character of the host building.
- 2.4 It is considered that the proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact on the character of the building or the character and appearance of the wider Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

## 3 Amenity

- 3.1 A number of concerns have been raised regarding the possible impact of the development on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

### Loss of sunlight/daylight

- 3.2 Given the height and depth of the existing part single and part 2 storey rear wings on both sides of the intervening side alleys, it is considered the proposed single storey extension would not significantly impede sightlines from the rear and side windows at no.5 and thus would not seriously worsen their existing daylight or sunlight.

### Loss of outlook

- 3.3 The existing outlook from the windows of the neighbouring property on the rear elevation and side elevation of the neighbouring property overlooks the boundary wall, the side elevation of No. 7 and the garden areas of both properties. The resulting extension would reduce the gap between the properties; however given its scale and the sloping roof, it is not considered to be significantly harmful towards neighbouring outlook, or have an overbearing impact in comparison to what exists.

### Light pollution

- 3.4 The proposed extension would be positioned approximately 1m away from the window on the rear elevation of no. 5. The solid boundary wall would serve as the side elevation of the extension with glazing is isolated to the roof and rear elevation. It is considered that given the

height of the boundary wall and as the roof slopes at a gentle angle that any potential lightspill would be limited. For this reason, it is considered the windows on the ground floor of the rear and side elevation would not be significantly affected. It is considered that the windows on the first floor of the neighbouring occupiers would be of a sufficient distance away from the proposed extension to not be significantly impacted.

- 3.5 The impact of the rear elevation of the extension and the new window would be isolated to the garden area of the host building due to the boundary wall between nos. 5, 7, and 9. The glazed extension would be set back from the existing building line. It is considered that the amount of light from the extension would not be significantly greater than the windows on the existing rear elevation and would not be to an unacceptable level in comparison to the existing situation given the nature of the rear of terrace properties.

**4. Recommendation** – Grant planning permission