

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | | 07/04/2010 | |
| | | | | Consultation Expiry Date: | | 22/03/2010 | |
| Officer | | | | Application Number(s) | | | |
| Jenny Fisher | | | | 2010/0345/P | | | |
| Application Address | | | | Drawing Numbers | | | |
| 11 Medley Road London NW6 2HJ | | | | Refer to decision letter | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| Re-orientation of stone steps leading to the front lower ground floor area and the replacement of an existing ground floor extension with a new full width extension to rear of lower /upper ground floor flat (Use Class C3) | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Grant planning permission with conditions | | | | | |
| Application Type: | | Full Planning Permission | | | | | |
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | No. notified | 23 | No. of responses | 00 | No. of objections | 00 | |
| | | | No. electronic | 00 | | | |
| Summary of consultation responses: | No response received to date. | | | | | | |
| Local groups comments: | No response received to date. | | | | | | |

Site Description

A three storey terraced house on the west side of Medley Road comprising two self-contained flats. The lower flat comprises lower and ground floors with front and rear garden space. The upper flat is at first floor level. Medley Road forms a cul-de-sac accessed from Iverson Road. The property backs onto a site that was formerly a redundant bakery enclosed on three sides by the garden walls to existing residential development to the north, west and east, and to the south by an adjoining railway embankment. The embankment has been designated as Private Open Space and a Site of Nature Conservation Importance by the London Ecology Unit. The terrace of houses that includes the application premises is not located within a conservation area.

Relevant History

8A Medley Road

11/11/2004 (2003/1855/P)

Change from light industrial use and erection of a three-storey block with lower ground floor, to provide accommodation for a mix of uses comprising 12 x self-contained flats (Use Class C3); 3 x office units (Use Class B1); and 1 x live/work unit (Sui Generis) with on-site parking for 2 cars.

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 (amenity for occupiers and neighbours), B1 (General design principles), B3 (Alterations and extensions).

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.

CS1 (make full use of site), CS5 (consider impact on neighbours); DP26 (managing impact on occupiers and neighbours).

CS14 (high standard of design), DP24 (character; setting; context)

Camden Planning Guidance

Assessment

Proposed

Lower ground floor:

Demolition of an existing partial width extension (10.8m. (l) x 3.2m. (w) x 2.6m. (h)) with a flat roof.

Erection of a single storey brick built full width rear extension (9.6m. (l) x 5m. (w) x 3.5m. (h)) with a hipped roof 1.3m. in height from the base to the apex of the roof. Along the side of the roof over the infill element of the extension adjacent to No. 10 two glazed roof panels (3.2m. (l) x 1.2m. (w)) would be installed. To the other side adjacent to No. 12 two velux roof lights (1.1m. (l) x .7m. (w)) would be installed. The tiled roof would match of the original house.

Sliding/folding doors would open onto the garden. The existing party wall between neighbouring properties would have a low parapet added to prevent the overspill of rainwater from the roof of the proposed extension.

Upper ground floor

There would be some internal reconfiguration of accommodation and at upper ground floor level and what is currently a bathroom to the rear would become a bedroom and clear glazing installed in the window frame. A room that is currently a bedroom would be fitted as a new bathroom and obscure glazing installed. Apart from the replacement of the type of glazing, both window openings would be retained as existing, both overlook the rear garden. Within the flank wall of the original house a small window (0.4m. x 0.6m.) current obscure glazed for a W.C. would be replaced with clear glazing, the W.C. would be added to the floor area of the new rear bedroom and the W.C. moved into the new bathroom.

Front

Existing steel steps leading from the pavement to the front lower ground area would be turned so that they run parallel with the pavement instead of right angles to it. The steps cannot be seen from the pavement.

Main issues for consideration are visual and amenity impact

Visual impact

The existing rear extension was built some time ago and it is currently in a state of dilapidation. There is no planning history but a neighbour confirmed that it has been in existence for a considerable time. The proposed extension would be reduced in length by 1 metre, however it would extend across the full width of the property adding bulk. Camden Planning Guidance states that full width extensions can dominate the original building

and may obscure original features and that they will be resisted where they are visible from the street.

In this case, notwithstanding the increase in width proposed, it is considered that the use of brick to match the existing building and the pitch of the roof would reduce the impact compared to the existing structure. The site is not within a conservation area and the building does not possess any architectural features of merit. The building immediately to the rear of the site is the recently completed Aerynn House (2004 approval referred to in 'history' above). There are no windows directly overlooking the site from the rear; the flank wall of the building to the rear of the application premises is blank. As a consequence the only complete visual impact of the proposed extension would be from the rear garden of the application premises itself, with partial views from gardens to the rear of neighbouring properties. The proposed extension would not be visible from the street. It is considered that the replacement structure would not harm, but improve the appearance of the building. The extension would only be partially visible from a few windows on the upper floors of some neighbouring properties.

There is no objection to new glazing proposed for upper ground floor windows or the re-orientation of the stone steps leading from the pavement to the front area. The reason for alterations to glazing is explained above (reconfiguration of rooms). The stone steps to the front are very steep and became dangerous during winter; the proposed alteration would create a safer access.

It is considered that there is no justifiable reason to refuse the application in design terms, it would comply with policies and planning guidance associated with matters of design.

Amenity

There is currently a gap 1.8m.(width) between the flank wall of the main building and the boundary with No. 10. This would be infilled and form part of the full width extension. The existing boundary wall is 1.8m high, it would be raised to 2.9m. The roof to the proposed extension would slope away from the boundary wall. A side wall (not fronting a highway) may be raised to 2m. in height without the need to apply for planning permission. In order to refuse development proposed the Council would need to consider the harm caused by the additional 0.9m. in height of the new boundary wall over PD limits. A site visit confirmed that the lower ground floor room in the adjacent property (No.10) is to a kitchen. There is a door from the kitchen to the garden in the rear elevation (in the same position as the application property) and window in the flank wall of the extension facing the side wall of the application extension. There is a second kitchen window in the rear elevation of the extension overlooking the garden.

B.R.E. guideline advises that impact to daylight of habitable rooms and kitchens should be considered. Some loss of light to the side window is likely; however unrestricted light would penetrate the kitchen from the garden to the rear. It is therefore considered that a reduction in daylight to the side would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the occupants of No.10.

The passage to the side of rear extensions to these properties does not provide valuable amenity space. The proposed extension would allow the applicant to create additional habitable space required whilst retaining a reasonable rear garden. It is considered that the loss of the side passage to the application premises, and possible overshadowing of the passage running along the side of the neighbouring property, would not result in the loss of valuable amenity space for either property.

Recommend approval with conditions including materials to match existing.

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